



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 2018

No. 11

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.
Creator and Redeemer, cleanse us from anything that hinders the knowing and doing of Your will. Give our lawmakers clean hands and pure hearts which will fit them to serve You and all people. Liberate them from forces that keep them from moving toward consensus. As they seek to bring unity to our Nation and world, teach them how to best serve the common welfare, to assure personal freedoms, and to fulfill the purposes of Your Kingdom. Lord, bless them beyond their expectations.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN, a Sen-

ator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BOOZMAN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FISA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a short while, the Senate will vote to reauthorize important provisions of the FISA Amendments Act. As we all know, section 702 remains one of the most important tools that our national security professionals use to combat terrorism and to keep Americans safe.

Let's be very clear about what section 702 does. It enables our intelligence community to collect communications from foreign terrorists on foreign soil who threaten America and our allies. That is what it does. Make no mistake—section 702 does not allow the targeting of American citizens, nor does it permit the targeting of anyone, no matter their nationality, who is known to be located here in the United States.

The men and women we trust to protect this country say that this capability is essential to their missions. They tell us that it has saved American lives. That is why we cannot let this capability lapse. The world remains dangerous. We need our Armed Forces and intelligence community to protect us, and they need us to give them the tools to do it.

I look forward to renewing this important provision on a bipartisan basis in a short while.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, Saturday will mark 1 year since President Trump's inauguration—a year spent working with Republicans to roll back runaway regulations, stand up for veterans, fund our troops, strengthen national security, and pass once-in-a-generation tax reform.

Today, unemployment is at its lowest level in over a decade. According to Gallup, the American people are more optimistic about their job prospects than they have been in 17 years. And just yesterday, the Dow Jones closed above 26,000 for the first time in history.

The engine of American free enterprise is the American people, and when government gets out of the way and helps provide the conditions for growth, good things happen.

Just yesterday, Apple—the highest valued public company in the world—announced a plan to create more than 20,000 new jobs and invest \$30 billion in new capital right here in our country. As a direct result of tax reform, Apple will pay special bonuses worth \$2,500 to employees and begin to repatriate the \$250 billion in cash it has been holding overseas. Let me repeat that. Billions and billions of dollars are coming back to America because Republicans passed historic tax reform and gave us a 21st-century tax code. This will have an impact not just in Silicon Valley but all across the country. In Harrodsburg, KY, Corning employs hundreds of people in a high-tech facility. It partners with Apple to manufacture the special glass used in iPhones and iPads. This glass is made in Kentucky.

Republicans in the House and Senate passed tax reform without a single Democratic vote, although I certainly hope our folks across the aisle will celebrate the new jobs in their States and the new opportunities that are already being created for their constituents. We know that when Washington gets

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S265

out of the way, American workers and job creators can do what they do best. The results are speaking for themselves.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on an urgent matter, Congress is fast approaching our Friday deadline to fund the government. The choice before us is quite simple: We can pass a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill to keep the government open, or Democrats in Congress can manufacture a crisis and force a government shutdown over the entirely unrelated issue of illegal immigration, which we have until March, at the very least, to resolve.

Leaders in both parties have engaged in constructive talks on the best solution for those who fall under the Obama administration's illegally established DACA Program, along with other important immigration issues. The President has made it clear that any immigration bill must not only treat the symptoms of illegal immigration but also address the conditions that cause it. His four pillars for reform are increasing border security, reforming chain migration, resolving the DACA issue, and addressing the visa lottery. Those are the four pillars.

My position is straightforward. When negotiators produce a compromise that the President supports, it will receive a vote here in the Senate. No such solution yet exists, so the negotiations continue. The DACA issue does not face urgent deadlines until March at the very earliest. Our deadline to fund the government is tomorrow. One is an emergency, and one is not.

Later today, we anticipate the House will pass a bill that continues government funding and also attends to another urgent bipartisan concern. It will reauthorize the State Children's Health Insurance Program for a full 6 years, giving needed security to the families of the 9 million American children who depend on the program for coverage.

A continuing resolution plus a 6-year SCHIP extension is a commonsense package that every Member of this body should support.

Just consider my Democratic colleagues' own words on this very subject of the Children's Health Insurance Program. Just last month, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania said: "Any uncertainty about the Children's Health Insurance Program is . . . an insult to the country." That is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. He represents 342,000 children enrolled in SCHIP. Now he will have a chance to end that uncertainty.

Our newest colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama, made SCHIP a central issue in his campaign. He presented himself as a champion of vulnerable kids. He said the Senate had to "stop playing political football with the health care of our children." Now he represents 150,000 of those children.

Will he help us put a stop to the political games?

The senior Senator from Ohio said: "Healthcare for our kids shouldn't be controversial . . . it shouldn't be partisan. It should be easy."

The junior Senator from Maine called a potential lapse in SCHIP "an abdication of our responsibility."

The junior Senator from Oregon said: "Struggling families would like to have some stability, not have their children be a bargaining chip in some broader vision."

All of these Democratic Senators represent tens of thousands of children who depend on SCHIP. I am more than puzzled why they would threaten to turn their backs on those children—and shut down the government while they are at it—over the entirely unrelated issue of illegal immigration. Why would anyone suggest it is a good idea to not fund SCHIP for 6 years and to not fund the government because they are upset over illegal immigration, which is an issue we have until March to address?

Last year, the Senate Finance Committee unanimously agreed on a proposal to extend SCHIP by 5 years. The continuing resolution we expect to take up will extend it for 6, with no partisan attachments. It shouldn't be a difficult vote.

There is nothing—nothing—in such a continuing resolution that my Democratic friends actually oppose. Surely they do not oppose continuing to fund programs for opioid treatment and prevention, even as negotiations continue on additional funding. Surely they do not oppose continuing to fund our military and our national security, even as negotiations continue on additional funding. They couldn't possibly want to cut off existing funding for veterans, the VA system, and America's seniors simply because we are still negotiating additional funding.

My friends on the other side of the aisle do not oppose a single thing in this bill—nothing. They know they can't possibly explain to our warfighters and veterans, to our seniors, to our opioid treatment centers, to the millions of vulnerable children and their families who depend on SCHIP for coverage—how do you explain this?—or to all Americans who rely on the Federal Government for critical services like food inspections and Social Security checks. Why would they filibuster government funding and shut down vital programs for Americans because we have not yet agreed on the best way to settle an unrelated issue that we have at least until March to resolve?

So let's fund the government, extend SCHIP, and do right by the millions of Americans who elected us to serve them. That is how we can continue serious discussions on issues facing our Nation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I move to the bulk of my remarks, let me respond to the majority leader's comments on CHIP.

First, let me say I am a good friend of Leader MCCONNELL. We are getting along quite nicely. I know what a difficult job he has, but sometimes he says things that are just way over the top, and I have to respond, as this morning, to his remarks on CHIP.

Of course, Democrats support CHIP, Leader MCCONNELL. You know that darn well. If we were in charge of this Chamber, we would have never let it expire, but your majority did, Leader MCCONNELL. Your majority let health insurance for 9 million children expire, even though there were bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress that would have extended it.

Now it is placed on the CR. That is a bad idea for so many reasons that I will get to shortly, and Republicans pretend Democrats are against CHIP. It is outrageous.

We are leaders of our parties, and we say certain things, but it seems the lack of straightforwardness, the lack of relying on any facts that is endemic at that end of Pennsylvania Avenue is seeping over to the majority leader's desk, and I regret that because what he said this morning about CHIP was outrageous. To suggest that Democrats are standing in the way of CHIP is drawing, Leader MCCONNELL, on a deep well of bad faith.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let's get to the issue at hand. Government funding expires at midnight tomorrow and still the House Republican majority is moving forward with a continuing resolution that is very likely to be unacceptable to the Senate and may well be unacceptable to House Republicans. The CR prepared by the Speaker is not an honest attempt to govern. As typical of this Republican majority, it was done with zero negotiations with Democrats. They could get away with that strategy on the tax bill when they forced it through reconciliation; they can't here.

When are our Republican leaders going to learn that the best way to

govern—the best way to accomplish things—is by talking to us, not dropping ultimatums on us that bear none of our input? That is what happened with the FISA bill. It nearly went down. That had divisions on both sides of the aisle. That is what is happening here, and it doesn't look good for the CR coming over from the House for that very reason.

Furthermore, the CR leaves out so many priorities that the American people want and demand—opioids, veterans, pensions. It doesn't resolve the fate of the Dreamers. It doesn't include an increase in military funding that Members from both sides of the aisle would support. It is just another kick of the can down the road because the Republicans—both in the Senate and the House and the White House—can't get their act together.

Even President Trump tweeted this morning that he opposed including CHIP on this bill. Does that mean he is against the CR? Who knows? It is a mess. We can't keep careening from short-term CR to short-term CR. If this bill passes, there will be no incentive to negotiate, and we will be right back here in a month with the same problems at our feet. Eventually, we need to make progress on the biggest of issues before us.

Don't ask me; ask Secretary Mattis. When you talk to him, he knows how bad it is to continue CRs on the defense side. Why would our Republican colleagues go along with that?

So this CR can't get the job done. House Republicans don't even know if they can pass it. Some Senate Republicans, like my friends from South Carolina and South Dakota, have said they don't want to vote for it. We are going to have to go in a different direction.

Ideally, we would all roll up our sleeves and try to reach an agreement on all of the issues we need to resolve. We can resolve the issues of caps for defense and nondefense spending; we can resolve disaster relief; we can resolve the healthcare issues; we can resolve immigration issues; and we can do all of this in a rather short time because work has already been done on each of them for a while.

We could easily sit down and find a cosmic agreement that would get the support of the majority on both sides, in both Houses, and keep the government open. Despite all the rhetoric around here, I genuinely believe that.

The one thing standing in our way is the unrelenting flow of chaos from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It has reduced the Republicans to shambles. We barely know whom to negotiate with. The President, on national television, tells Congress to bring him something, and he will sign it. The majority leader says he needs the President's imprimatur before we cut any deal. The President is like Abbott and Leader MCCONNELL is like Costello: You do it. They point at each other and nothing gets done.

Of course, the principal reason the Republicans are in such disarray is, the President and his team have been agents of chaos in these negotiations since day one. After all, President Trump was the one who said last year that we need "a good 'shutdown' . . . to fix mess!" The President said we need a government shutdown.

Mr. President, 95 percent of all Americans, I would guess, do not agree with you. I would guess in their hearts, 95 percent of all Senators and Congressmen—Democratic and Republican—don't agree with you, President Trump, when you say we need a good shutdown.

Don't just ask me. Here is POLITICO. They are a rather down-the-middle publication. No one thinks they are leftwing or rightwing. No one thinks they are FOX or MSNBC. Here is the headline: "Negotiators on Hill find Trump an unreliable partner." Lawmakers find it difficult or impossible to negotiate when the President can't seem to stick to a position for more than a few hours. Let me read the first paragraph of this article:

Donald Trump ran for President as a bipartisan deal-maker. But if there's one thing he's proved after a year in office, he's better at killing bipartisan deals than clinching them.

Again, that is the first paragraph in this paper. I am going to read it again so the American people hear it loud and clear—and I know some of the rivals of this publication don't like it too much, but c'est la vie. "Negotiators on Hill find Trump an unreliable partner." The first paragraph:

Donald Trump ran for President as a bipartisan deal-maker, but if there's one thing he's proved after a year in office, he's better at killing bipartisan deals than clinching them.

No truer words were ever written. That is not fake news, Mr. President. We all know it to be true.

Exhibit A, yesterday regarding the discussions on DACA, the majority leader said: "I'm looking for something that President Trump is going to support. And he has not yet indicated what measure he is willing to sign." MITCH MCCONNELL said that. He said he still has to "figure out what [the President] is for."

How can you negotiate when the President—who has to sign legislation—is like a sphinx on this issue or at least says one thing one day and another the next?

The President rescinded DACA 4 or 5 months ago. Had he not rescinded DACA, we would not be here today. Remember, the vast majority of the American people—even a narrow majority of Trump supporters—support keeping the kids here, not sending them home. The President rescinded DACA 4 or 5 months ago and told Congress to fix it. Yet the majority leader of his party seems to have no firm idea what policy the President would support to get that done. At this late hour, that is astonishing.

Exhibit B, the President's Chief of Staff has insisted that Senator COTTON and Representative GOODLATTE be in the room for negotiations on DACA. I have great respect for each of them as individuals—or the respect every Senator gives to every other Senator and Member of Congress, although I so objected to what Senator COTTON did to Senator DURBIN the other day. But having said that, there is no deal that Senator COTTON or Representative GOODLATTE supports that would earn the support of the majority in either the House or the Senate.

If Senator COTTON and Representative GOODLATTE, who have opposed DACA all along and have basically been strongly anti-immigration, have veto power over an agreement, everyone knows there will not be an agreement. General Kelly must know that.

Then, just this morning—exhibit B prime—President Trump rebuked General Kelly, his own Chief of Staff, on Twitter for saying that he is fighting for a wall different from the one he campaigned on. So that is exhibit B on the incompetence of the Republicans on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue—mixed messages, conflicting signals, chaos.

Exhibit C. Today, with the government shutdown one day away, President Trump is off campaigning in Pennsylvania instead of staying in Washington to help close a deal. We are 1 day away from a government shutdown, and there is no one home at the White House. The President should be here negotiating. There is no better evidence that the President doesn't give a hoot if the government shuts down than the fact that he is away campaigning today, 1 day before the shutdown looms.

We have spent the last few months negotiating in good faith with our Republican counterparts, trying desperately to find a deal we could all live with, but it has been nearly impossible to reach final agreement with this President. He has oscillated between completely opposing positions in a matter of days, sometimes hours. He has signaled an openness to a deal, only to have his staff pull him back. He has given only vague indications of what he wants, even at this late hour.

MITCH MCCONNELL was right; he doesn't know what the President stands for. Now MITCH MCCONNELL ought to have the strength and courage to start negotiating on his own for the good of the country, but that hasn't happened yet either.

The White House has done nothing but sow chaos, confusion, division, and disarray, and it may just lead to a government shutdown that no one wants and that all of us here have been striving to avoid.

The fact remains that there is a bipartisan deal on the table, led by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN. Seven Democrats and seven Republicans are on the bill right now. I hope and suspect more will join. It includes significant concessions from Democrats on

almost every item the President requested, including his full budget request for border security, changes to family reunification—which he calls chain migration—and an end to the diversity lottery system.

There is no other alternative on the table. I repeat: There is no other alternative on the table. If my Republican friends want to protect the Dreamers, as over 70 percent of Americans say we should, this is the deal.

The White House is not going to help us; we know that. We have to do it ourselves. Once we do it, we can solve all of our other problems on defense and domestic spending, on healthcare, including CHIP, community health center extenders, disaster relief, and more.

Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work on both sides of the aisle, regardless of the dithering, the indecision, and the contradictory statements of the White House.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 139, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 139, a bill to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1870 (to the House amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1871 (to amendment No. 1870), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:15 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, when we complete our work today on the FISA issue, we will be consumed by the issue of a continuing resolution and the need for continued appropriations to keep government functions available to the American people.

I come with a suggestion that I think is based not on politics but upon commonsense and perhaps just the good business aspect of getting our work done. My suggestion to our colleagues is that we do not shut down government. I think the outcome of that is not good, and I can list the reasons. I have had constituents from time to time tell me "shut her down. It wouldn't matter to me," but I can list the circumstances in which it really does matter to everyday folks in Kansas and across the country. At the same time, we should force ourselves to do work that we seemingly are unwilling or unable to complete. There is a whole list of things that are pending, and they have been pending for a long time.

The Presiding Officer and I serve on the Appropriations Committee, and one of the positions that I think we share is the desire to see that the appropriations process works. That means that we would do a budget. The Budget Committee would do a budget, and the Senate and the House would approve the budget. We would do 12 appropriations bills that fill in the budget space. We would be able to prioritize spending. We could increase, reduce, or eliminate spending. Then, we could again send a message to agencies, departments, and cabinets that we have the ability to determine how much money they have to spend and, therefore, have the opportunity to influence decisions that are made that affect the American people through the bureaucracy and through the administration in such significant ways.

So the goal here is to keep government functioning—no shutdown—but also to have the discipline necessary to put an appropriations process in place to get us out of a CR.

Immigration, from DACA to border security, is certainly a topic of conversation in Congress, and negotiations are apparently ongoing and it is an issue that needs to be resolved. If we are going to make fixes to our immigration system, now is better than later. If border security is important, now is better than later to improve border security. If certainty in people's lives is important, now is better than later.

Many of us have a concern that we are not adequately funding the defense side. We face many threats, from China in the Pacific to Russia and its intrusion, from cyber issues that affect our

national security to terrorism and the Middle East. If additional money is necessary for our intelligence capabilities and for our national defense, now is better than later.

What may happen here is that we will pass a continuing resolution that takes us weeks into the future and we will operate under a continuing resolution, or, if that is not possible, nothing may pass for several days and the so-called government shutdown would occur.

Here is what I would ask us to do. Let us do a continuing resolution for a day or so at a time, keeping government open, which puts the pressure on negotiations to occur to resolve the variety of issues that are out there today that, in all likelihood, will be attached to a final resolution. The question is, Do we do it now? Do we force those negotiations to occur and a resolution of those issues to happen? Do we force that today by being in a continuing resolution that is a very short period of time? Or do we give ourselves another month to allow the conversations to continue, and, in all likelihood, if history is any indication, a month from now we will be saying: Well, we need another CR while we continue.

The issues are important that are before us, and Congress has the habit of delaying resolutions of issues until the moment of crisis arrives. My point is this: Keep the pressure on us today. Do not let us walk away from here now without keeping government open, but do not let us leave the Senate and the Congress until we have resolved the issues in front of us. Those issues include healthcare, immigration, funding for national defense, domestic spending, and issues related to disaster—the Senator who presides today is from Florida—whether or not we do disaster assistance, which is a need as a result of the hurricanes that have caused tremendous damage in Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico. If we need that disaster relief—if it is needed—it is needed now, not later.

I have raised this topic. I have had this conversation with many of my colleagues.

I encourage us to continue to resolve our differences today—they will not be easier tomorrow—and make certain that we have an opportunity for us to then deal with the important issues that are still ahead of us. Outside of any agreement that might be reached in the next several days, we need to deal with issues that are important—what I would describe as issues that we will be dealing with that are normally important to us in May and June. But May and June will be occupied by the things we should have resolved now. So that in May and June, we will do the things we could have done today, and we will not be taking care of the July issues.

Common sense tells me that we can find a solution to the problems if we work at it, but if we allow ourselves to escape from the process today or tomorrow—if we return home—we will be

back in the same position next week and the week after that and the week after, which we are in today.

It is just a simple plea that the Senate exhibit some common sense, some good business practices. Let's resolve our differences now, and then let's take on the next issues that are so important to the country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, later this week, we are going to reach 1 year since President Trump was sworn into office as President of the United States. From what I have seen and from what I have heard, visiting with people at home, all around the State of Wyoming, his first year has been a huge success.

People are telling me, telling their friends, and telling their neighbors that America is finally headed in the right direction again. People tell me that they feel optimistic—optimistic because of the policies that Republicans have put in place over this past year.

The polling company Gallup says it is not just happening in Wyoming; it is happening all across the country. They had a report the other day that said Americans' confidence in our economy was positive in 2017, and they say that this was the first positive annual average since they started tracking these numbers back in 2008—the first time ever.

As soon as Donald Trump was elected President, economic confidence began to soar. It has stayed positive every single month since election day of 2016.

Gallup has said that this is the exact opposite of what they had seen for the previous 8 years.

In another poll last week, Gallup said that people are also more optimistic about the job market. They found that Americans' confidence about finding a job—a quality job—was the highest it has been in the 17 years since they have been asking that question as well.

They said that there was a “sharp increase” over the year before—in 2016, when President Obama was in charge—in people's feelings about being able to find a quality job. People are confident, and they are much more optimistic about the future. We see the signs of it everywhere we turn.

Stores had their biggest holiday sales since 2008. When people are feeling confident, they feel it is OK to go shopping. They feel there is going to be the income to cover the things they are interested in having for Christmas and

the gifts they can give. They can relax. That is the kind of optimism we are seeing now.

It is because they see that President Trump and Republicans in Congress are serious about improving America's economy. They see that we are serious about giving relief to Americans who have been getting buried under an avalanche of redtape.

The President has cut through massive amounts of regulations. Congress has rolled back 15 different major regulations from the Obama administration. That is going to save Americans as much as \$36 billion over time because of the regulatory burden that has been relieved. These are regulations that harmed Americans and wiped out American jobs. Now those regulations are gone.

When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to regulation, it gives them confidence. It makes them more optimistic about the future.

A lot of the regulations that Democrats wrote had to do with their war on American energy. Democrats shut down a lot of energy exploration and energy development in America. They shut down attempts to export American energy. They even wrote rules to put the United States at a competitive disadvantage when we tried to develop energy resources overseas.

Republicans have stopped Washington's war on American energy. We are opening up more areas to responsible energy production off of our coasts and in part of Alaska. Our goal should be to make American energy as clean as we can, as fast as we can, without raising costs on American families.

Republicans have put policies in place to restore that balance to America's energy policy.

Now people are talking about not just energy security, energy independence, but American energy dominance. When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to energy, it gives them confidence.

People see that Republicans are delivering on other promises as well, such as giving American families serious tax relief. This tax law that passed at the end of last year is giving back more than \$1 trillion to Americans over time. It is letting people keep more of their hard-earned money. It is spurring economic growth. It is going to make it simpler for a lot of families to fill out their taxes.

When people see that Washington is finally taking the right approach to taxes, it gives them more confidence, more optimism. They are confident because they are already seeing the direct result in their paychecks.

At least 166 companies have said that they are going to give raises, give out bonuses, and invest more in their workers because of the tax law. More than 2,236,000 workers across this country are getting more money in their pockets as a result of these raises and bonuses. Some of the folks who are get-

ting bonuses are people who work at Walmart. That is one of the biggest employers in my State of Wyoming. People who work there are getting bonuses, they are getting higher wages, and they are getting expanded maternity leave benefits—one advantage after another—as a result of the tax law that was passed by a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by President Trump. These workers are noticing the extra money. It is going to make a difference to them and to their families. It is not just a one-time bump for people; economists say that this tax relief legislation is going to boost the economy for years to come.

There was a story on CNBC Monday that quoted an official from one European bank. He said that President Trump has “changed the perception of what's possible in Washington.”

The American economy has roared back to life. We are finally—finally—having the economic recovery that we should have had 8 years ago. That is because we finally got the policies that allow our economy to grow the way it should. We had a big recession in this country. Democrats used that as an excuse to pile a bunch of regulations on the American people. That had a lot to do with keeping the economy from recovering at the pace it should have.

During the Obama administration, there was talk about the “new normal.” People said that maybe it was just the way things were going to be in America from now on—slow, tepid economic growth, weak recovery, wages that didn't grow, people out of work for years at a time. That is what we saw in that administration. Now we know that it was never normal, it was never acceptable, and it was never the way things had to be. Things could be different, and the American people voted to make things different. In 2016, they said it was time for a change. Republicans are showing that the economy can grow faster once we get the right policies in place. America can be a greater place for all of us.

We head into President Trump's second year with an economy much stronger than it was the day he took office. We have more Americans at work. We have businesses and families confident that the economy will be even better this year. I think that is the kind of thing that people mean when they tell me they feel confident and optimistic in the direction of our country again. I see that confidence in Wyoming. We see it on Wall Street, and we see it all across the United States. Democrats might miss the Obama economy of higher taxes and more regulation. Republicans are fighting to continue the policies that are giving Americans confidence, optimism, and hope. Republicans know this is just the beginning.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2319 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise very briefly to thank my friend, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

One more time, I urge all of our colleagues to vote for S. 139, which will be coming up for a vote in a few moments.

This is a critical tool that our intelligence community uses on a regular basis to keep America safe. It is a tool that—as someone who has more, perhaps, observance of this program than most—I do not believe has been abused or will be abused. This legislation includes meaningful reforms on furthering civil liberties protections and making sure that a year from now, the questions that many Members have asked over the years, particularly of the Bureau, will be answered.

I think this forethought legislation needs to pass and needs to pass with an overwhelming majority.

Again, I thank the chairman for his good work. We had a 12-to-3 vote out of our committee on this legislation. We had a 60-to-38 vote that moved us forward on the cloture motion. My hope is that many other colleagues who care deeply about national security will join us in the final passage of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman of the committee, Senator WARNER.

I think what we have seen is a process that has tried to take into account concerns that not just Members but the American people have had with programs that operate in a degree of secrecy, and I think most Americans understand why.

The assurance I have tried to make and the vice chairman has tried to make to our colleagues and to the American people is that we are vigilant in the rigorous oversight of not just this program but of the entire complex of intelligence in the United States. It is our job as committee members, and we do it without the clarity that most members would like to have on issues. I respect the fact that some still disagree with us, though the number is small. I also feel extremely proud today that we are getting ready to, in the next few minutes, reauthorize the single most important intelligence tool that exists for us to keep the American people safe.

I think we will look back on this as a needed tool. Today, the threat landscape looks worse than it probably ever has. The reason Americans can safely go to bed at night is that there are a

lot of dedicated folks to whom we provide tools in order to keep them safe. It starts with a vote in this body, and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote, when given the opportunity shortly, to reauthorize the 702 program.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT
NO. 1870

Madam President, I move to table the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendment to accompany S. 139.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reed
Burr	Hassan	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Carper	Heitkamp	Rounds
Casey	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Schumer
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Corker	Jones	Shaheen
Cornyn	Kaine	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cotton	King	Thune
Crapo	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Warner
Duckworth	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Feinstein	Nelson	

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Harris	Paul
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heller	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Smith
Brown	Leahy	Sullivan
Cantwell	Lee	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL S. 139

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 98, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 139.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each until 7 p.m., with the time equally divided, and that all quorum calls during that time also be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

PROTECTING LIFE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to get a chance to address an ongoing conversation that is happening in Washington, DC, right now and will be over in the next 36 hours. As unusual as this may sound, with all of the drama that is happening here, just outside this building there are tens of thousands of people—most of them students—who are gathered in Washington, DC, preparing for something called the March for Life. This has happened for decades now. Students and adults come from all over the country to Washington, DC, to quietly speak

for those who cannot speak for themselves—children still in the womb—and to be able to speak out for the protection of life.

It is an interesting conversation that has a tremendous amount of science, a tremendous amount of faith, and a tremendous amount of heat around it, as some individuals don't want to discuss the issue of abortion or would simply say: That is a woman's choice; we need to set that aside and ignore it.

There is a whole group of students who arrive here saying: Wait a minute. That child in the womb has 10 fingers and 10 toes, unique DNA that is different from the mom and different from the dad. The child feels pain in the womb and has a beating heart. That doesn't sound like tissue to me; that sounds like a child.

They are raising great issues that, quite frankly, science reinforces as well.

Last week, I had the opportunity to be able to stop by one of the great research facilities in Oklahoma. They are doing tremendous research on cancer, on MS, on Alzheimer's, and a lot more. I stopped by one of the labs and talked to one of the scientists there. They are actually doing research on zebra fish.

Now, as odd as this may sound, they are actually taking zebra fish eggs and developing those eggs. As they are first beginning to hash out of the eggs, they are injecting them with a gene that they know to be cancerous in humans, allowing that to be able to develop in the zebra fish and seeing the abnormalities there. Then, they try to treat it with different drugs to be able to see if once they get the abnormalities, they can reverse it. They are literally taking the zebra fish, creating problems, and seeing if they can fix them.

They are going into great detail. The microscopes, the work, the millions of dollars that have gone into this research are all for one simple thing—the ability to be able to cure diseases that affect human life.

As a culture, we have determined that life is valuable. Human life, especially, is valuable and precious. The challenge that we have is determining when that life begins. I and millions of others believe that life begins at conception, when that child has a different DNA than the mom or the dad. That tissue is not just the mom's tissue at that point; it is growing independently. There is no difference in that child in the womb and the child that is in the backyard playing, laughing, and going down the slide, other than time. There is no difference.

Last year, Cleveland Cavaliers' guard J.R. Smith and his wife had little Dakota. When I say "little Dakota," I mean little Dakota. She was born at less than 1 pound at 19 weeks of development. She left the hospital 5 months later at 7 pounds, 4 ounces—7 pounds, 5 ounces, actually.

When she left the hospital, it was a remarkable event. It was celebrated all over social media—this guard with the

NBA Cleveland Cavaliers and this beautiful child leaving.

Dakota is now 1 year old, and it has been interesting the stir that happened around her birth as a lot of people stopped and thought about a child that small and that young. It was interesting. The CNN articles that came out at the same time as little Dakota's birth noted that a child at 23 weeks of development has a 50 to 60 percent chance of survival now. Science has changed a lot over the last several decades. A lot has happened. It is remarkable to hear the stories of surgeries that are happening in utero.

In 1995, Roberto Rodriguez actually went through surgery still in the womb. He had major problems in his left lung, and at 20 weeks, they went in and did surgery in utero, fixing his left lung. It allowed him to finish out his term, and 13 weeks later he was delivered healthy. Little Roberto Rodriguez is now 22 years old.

This technology is not new anymore. In many ways, the science has far surpassed what were our conversations here in America dealing with policy around children.

Back in 1970, when the Supreme Court passed *Roe v. Wade*, they had this whole conversation about viability and that government has a right to be able to step in and protect children at the moment that they are viable. Well, in the 1970s, that was very different than what it is now. Now we see children at 21, 20, 22 weeks of development being born and being natural, healthy, great children. We need to be able to catch up in law.

We may disagree on a lot of things on life. As I have already stated, I believe life begins at conception. In this body, I know there are a lot of conversations, saying: How do we actually get to a sense of commonality and common ground on these issues.

Well, let me just lay down three different areas where I would say that maybe we could find some common ground on these three areas. Though we may disagree on when life begins, can we at least agree that Americans have the freedom of conscience? Can we at least agree on the late-term abortions, when a child is clearly viable? And can we at least agree that when a child is born alive, they should be protected? Let me just hit those three very quickly.

The first one is just basic freedom of conscience, allowing an individual to be able to live out their conscience. I spoke to several nurses just a few months ago. When those nurses were hired at the hospitals they worked in, they told the individuals in HR and the physicians they worked with that they believed life begins at conception and they had a moral and conscience belief that they wanted to protect children. They were told at that moment: You will not have to participate in abortions. We understand your conscience belief, and we will protect your conscience belief. For years, they did not.

Then, suddenly, they ran short in nurses at one moment, and they pulled each of them in at different times and in different hospitals and in different States. They told the stories that they had been pulled into a procedure, being told on the way in: We need you in this procedure—arriving only to find out it was an abortion they were being forced to assist with. They were appalled to be part of the death of a child rather than protecting the life of a child. Each of them was told: You will lose your job if you don't participate in the taking of this child's life. That is an unfair place to put them in.

Individuals should be able to have the freedom of conscience and should be able to live out their moral and spiritual beliefs. I would never go to an abortion doctor and force him to peacefully protest against his own abortion clinic. That would be absurd. But for some reason, pro-abortion hospitals see no issue in at times compelling a staff member to participate in something they find objectionable, even when they made their stance clear.

We should never force a person to administer a lethal injection in a prison if they have a moral objection to the death penalty. That seems only reasonable. We are rightfully furious when a man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't respond to his advances. No one would say that if she doesn't like his advances, she could just go find another job. But for some in our culture, they want to look away when that same man threatens a woman with firing if she doesn't violate her conscience and help perform an abortion. They are willing to tell her: Just quit and go find another job. What is the difference?

We wouldn't compel a vegan to eat meat at the company barbecue, would we? Why would we compel a person to assist in the taking of a life when they are personally offended by the practice?

The right of conscience should be protected for every person. Religious intolerance is a personal choice, not a legal requirement in America.

Late-term abortions are another area where I think we should be able to find common ground, and we should be able to protect these children. We should agree that elective late-term abortions should be ended in America. This is an elective abortion after 5 months of pregnancy. When the child's nervous system is fully developed, they can feel pain at that point.

We in America, because of the pro-abortion lobby and the activists who are around them, have lost track of this simple fact: We are one of seven nations in the world that allow elective abortions after 22 weeks of gestation. In fact, of these seven nations that allow abortions after 22 weeks of gestation, three of them—Canada, Singapore, and the Netherlands—allow elective abortions only until 24 weeks, just 2 weeks later. But there are only four countries in the world that allow elective abortions at any moment. Are you

ready for this club? There are four nations that are like us: the United States, Vietnam, North Korea, and China. That is it. Those four nations allow elective abortions at any stage. That is a horrible club for the United States of America to be in. Those countries are some of the worst human rights violators in the world, and that is the elite club in which we find ourselves.

The pro-abortion lobby is so powerful and so wealthy, and they are so engaged, they are not willing to relent that even one child's life could be protected, even when they are clearly viable, leaving the United States in this horrible collection with Vietnam, North Korea, and China on abortion policy. At 5 months old, a child in the womb can kick, stretch, yawn, smile, suck its thumb, and feel pain. It is a viable child.

Late-term abortions represent only 1.3 percent of all abortions in America. I would contend we should stop this practice altogether. There are 191 nations that don't allow this—191 nations. There is no reason we should not as well.

This is interesting. The Washington Post heard several people quote that statistic about seven nations are the only nations that actually allow any abortions at this late stage. Those three that I mentioned—the Netherlands, Canada, and Singapore—allow them up to 24 weeks but not after that. So they ran their famous Fact Checker on this issue. The Washington Post ran through all of it and looked at it and said: This sounds like this is not correct. They ran through the whole study, looked at it, fact-checked the whole thing, and at the end of it came back and said: No, it actually is correct. What seemed a dubious statement in the beginning they fact-checked and gave what the Washington Post calls their elite Gepetto qualification—that means no Pinocchios; true statement.

We should be able to resolve this. I have made no secret that I believe that life begins at conception, but I would say to this group that not everyone agrees with me on this, but we should at least be able to protect life when it is viable.

Let me add one more detail to this that is painful to even discuss. Of those late-term abortions that occur—those 1.3 percent of abortions that occur during this late time period—the child is too large and too well developed to actually have a traditional abortion procedure, so the abortions are done by the abortion doctor reaching in with a tool into the womb and literally pulling the child's arms and legs off, allowing the child to bleed to death in the womb and then pulling its parts out a piece at a time. Why do we allow that in America? As I said, 191 other nations do not. All of Europe does not. When is the last time you heard me say our social policy needs to catch up with Europe? We are better than this.

One last statement, because I have some colleagues who want to join me

in this conversation. We should be able to agree on a simple principle: that if an abortion is conducted and it is botched and instead of destroying the child in the womb, the abortion doctor actually induces the delivery—in those rare cases, the current practice is, when the child is delivered, everyone in the operating room backs away and allows the child to die of exposure on the table, because they can't actually take the life anymore; it has been fully delivered.

Kermit Gosnell sits in prison right now because, as an abortionist in Philadelphia, he was in the practice of delivering children and then killing them after they were delivered. It is already a crime to physically take the life of that individual, so the current practice is, if they mess up the abortion and deliver instead of destroy, they just allow the child to die on its own, crying on the table. Can we as Congress and as Americans at least agree that it is barbaric to watch a crying child on the table slowly die; that at least at that moment of delivery, we would agree a child is a child when we can see all 10 of their fingers, see all 10 of their toes, and hear their voice crying on the table? This is an issue that shouldn't be controversial. This is an issue for which we should find great compassion.

I would challenge this body, when we deal with conscience and when we deal with late-term abortions and when we deal with children who are born alive, that we find resolution in those areas.

I am aware this is a difficult topic. I understand that for many people, this conversation is painful to even consider and that for the millions of American women who have experienced abortion in their personal lives, this is painful to even consider. But I am also aware that until we talk about these hard issues and resolve them, they will continue to advance.

We are better than this as a nation. Let's prove it in the way we treat our most vulnerable.

With that, I ask unanimous consent for colloquy time with some of my colleagues, and I would like to be able to recognize Senator BLUNT from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am here with the Senator from Oklahoma—and we are about to be joined by the Senator from Iowa—to talk about the topic Senator LANKFORD just said is difficult to talk about. When you actually stand up and explain what is going on, it is hard to imagine that we still let these things happen.

I would suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that we could talk about the fact that the minds of people have changed on this issue. Almost all change their minds once we explain the two things the Congress is focused on this year. Polling on this shows that I believe 63 percent of all Americans now

believe that these late-term abortions should not be allowed to occur.

As Senator LANKFORD pointed out so well, the countries that allow this to happen are not the countries whose social policies we would want to be aligned with, including China and North Korea, which have a stated purpose of eliminating children for no other reason than just population control, and they wind up eliminating more female children than male children in that process because apparently their belief is that the male child has more economic value going forward. Why would we want to be aligned with countries that look at these issues that way or just simply think the pain should be allowed?

The House has passed the pain-capable bill. Where are we now in the House on the born-alive bill? Is it to be voted on this week, or has it been voted on already?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the House passed both the pain-capable and the infant protection born-alive bills in prior months. The Senate has yet to take that up, and it is our hope in the Senate to be able to bring that up for real dialogue in conversations in the days ahead.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I think the pain-capable bill was passed by the House in October.

We have thousands of Americans coming this week, focusing on tomorrow, to talk about this issue. These two bills are two of their priorities, but of course their priority is to honor life. The March for Life is designed to do exactly that.

Clearly, the March for Life—now in its 45th year—is not a celebration. It is not an anniversary or a celebration; rather, it is a time to remember that there is a lot that we still need to do to ensure that our society is a society that values every human life no matter how small, no matter how vulnerable, no matter how little capacity that life has to protect itself. And the way that society, I think, has decided to deal with this is looking at things like partial-birth abortion, the description of which was every bit as bad as the dismembering abortions, but Congress stepped forward on that topic. Some people who performed that particular act didn't stop doing it, but they are in trouble when you find out they have done it.

So thousands of people from all over the country—in fact, tens of thousands of people; it is a number that I believe is always underreported. Based on looking at the March for Life crowd and any other crowds we see here, I guarantee that the final number—if you take any of those crowds and look at them, I believe there is a willingness to ignore the thousands of people who come in buses from all over the country, in the worst possible weather more years than not, to stand up and say: We don't want this to happen.

I think young people are increasingly more and more defensive of the idea of

life and more and more offended about the places where we have chosen not to draw the line. How can you possibly justify a baby who is born alive and the process that Senator LANKFORD just described where you can't take that life but you can step back and not do anything to save that life, or the uniquely troubled countries we are involved in that allow developed children—boys and girls, 10 fingers, 10 toes, the ability to feel pain—to inflict that pain on those children at that time.

The American people don't support this. Almost nobody who understands what is going on supports it. But if you are asked in polling, I think, as I said earlier, 63 percent—more than 6 out of 10 Americans—say: How can we be continuing to let that happen?

So supporting those who come here, responding to those who understand this—and certainly the two Senators on the floor here—the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Oklahoma are among the best advocates for life, among the best advocates for getting information out about life, about adoption, about what happens and what our laws allow and the laws of other countries don't allow.

Certainly I will be welcoming the March for Life this year in Missouri and other States. The Vice President last year became the first Vice President in the history of the country to speak to March for Life and made it clear where his views were and where the administration stands.

The missing component here to do the right thing is in Congress itself. We have an opportunity to step up and do that. We need to have this debate on the floor because people, once they enter into this debate, realize it is not a debate that they want to be in, because the wrong side of this is the side where slightly more than a handful of countries allow it to happen, what we allow to happen.

I am pleased to be here on the floor with Senator LANKFORD and Senator ERNST.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues from Oklahoma and Missouri, and we will be joined shortly by the Senator from Montana as well.

I am rising today to discuss the importance of protecting and celebrating life.

As I travel across the State of Iowa, I have had the opportunity to hear directly from families whose lives have been changed by the innovative, life-affirming services offered by their local pregnancy resource center. There are so many more stories of vulnerable lives saved all across the country, not just in Iowa but all across the country.

I would like to begin by recognizing the critical, on-the-ground actions of these pregnancy resource centers, maternity homes, and adoption agencies across the country that are changing and saving lives. I want to thank them for all they do.

Since coming to Washington, I have tried to hold Congress accountable to do its part to protect the most vulnerable in our society. The Senator from Missouri has mentioned that we can measure a society, and ours is a great society, but we can do more to protect those who are vulnerable. For example, last January, I introduced legislation to defund Planned Parenthood while protecting women's healthcare centers. As I have stated time and again, taxpayers should not be forced to foot the bill for roughly half a billion dollars annually for an organization like Planned Parenthood that exhibits such disrespect for human life. Despite what they may claim otherwise, Planned Parenthood is not the Nation's pre-eminent provider of women's healthcare. For example, Planned Parenthood facilities don't even perform in-house mammograms. They don't do that. Community health centers, on the other hand, continue to greatly outnumber Planned Parenthoods. They provide greater preventive primary healthcare services, regardless of a person's ability to pay.

Additionally, last April, President Trump signed my legislation into law that ensures States are not forced to provide entities like Planned Parenthood—the Nation's single largest provider of abortions—with Federal title X dollars.

I am grateful to have worked with Congresswoman DIANE BLACK, a dear friend in the House; my Senate colleagues, who are with me here today; and President Trump to make sure States are not forced to award providers like Planned Parenthood with taxpayer dollars through title X family planning grants.

Another effort my colleagues and I continue to work on is passing Senator GRAHAM's Pain-Capable Unborn Children Protection Act in the Senate. Whenever I discuss this bill, I cannot help but share the remarkable story of a very special family from Newton, IA.

In July 2012, Micah Pickering was born prematurely at just 20 weeks postfertilization—the very age at which this bill would prohibit abortions. When he was born, Micah was only—if you can imagine it—about the size of a bag of M&Ms, about the size of the palm of my hand. Yet Micah was still a perfectly formed baby with 10 fingers and 10 toes.

When I first met Micah, he was just a few years old, and he came to visit me in my office. We had a photo of Micah when he was just born. Again, folks, he was the size of the palm of my hand, a little bag of M&Ms. I had that photo in my office. Little Micah ran up to that photo, and he pointed at it and said: Baby.

And we said: Yes, Micah, that is a baby. That is a baby.

Just a few months ago, I had the opportunity to visit again with Micah and his parents in my DC office. I can attest that now at 5 years old, Micah remains a happy, healthy, energetic

little boy. Stories like Micah's show all of us that at 5 months, an unborn child is a child—just as Micah would say—a baby.

There is also significant scientific evidence that at 5 months of development, these babies can feel pain. Yet there is no Federal law protecting these vulnerable babies from abortion. As a result, every year in our country, the lives of thousands of babies just like Micah end painfully through abortion. Currently, the United States is 1 of only 7 countries to allow abortions at 5 months of gestation. We are in the company of China and North Korea. Folks, this is unacceptable.

There is much work to be done in the ongoing fight to protect life. We understand that. As folks from across the country travel to Washington to "March for Life" this week, I am urging my colleagues to join me in calling for a vote on this critical legislation that recognizes these unborn babies as the children they are and provides them the same protection from pain and suffering that all of our children deserve—again, as Micah Pickering would say, "a baby."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator SASSE to join us for this colloquy as well.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I say thank you very much to the Senator from Oklahoma and thanks to the Senator from Montana for spelling me. I have been sitting in the Presiding chair during this colloquy, so I have not been on the ground floor able to participate, but I would like to associate myself with this colloquy and with the leadership of the Senators from Oklahoma, Missouri, Iowa, and Montana.

I, too, know Micah, and it is an amazing thing. I wish all 100 Senators had a chance to know Micah and his family. I also want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Oklahoma, as he began this, that we are one of only four countries in the world that allow elective abortion at any time for any reason. Our peers in this are North Korea, China, and Vietnam, and it is a genuine shame. The American people need to understand that, and this body needs to grapple with that reality.

As the Senator from Missouri said, it is special to be a part of the rally and march over the next 36 hours because the college kids who are coming here understand this far better than the general public. There is a movement in this country to want to respect and celebrate life, and good things are happening generationally with this cause.

I want to associate myself with this colloquy and thank the Senator from Montana for spelling me from the chair. Thank you.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this is a difficult issue for so many people because it is intensely personal for so many people. We understand full well the grief some families have when this

topic comes up because there are millions of men and women who they know their child has been aborted. We get that. We want to have incredible compassion for them as they struggle through some of the most difficult decisions of their life. We understand that when they go to the mall and they watch a small child laugh in the food court of the mall, they wonder in the back of their head, "Would that have sounded like my child when they laughed?"

We get the grief they live with for the rest of their life as they process through what some physician told them was tissue, but in their heart they know was a child. This is a nation that can set some basic principles to help those individuals, to promote adoption, to be able to encourage those families and help walk alongside them. We are good at grace and compassion as a nation. We can continue to be better at it. One of the ways we have to be able to express that is for the most vulnerable, for those children who have yet to be born.

I would like to invite the Senator from Montana to also join in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I thank Senator LANKFORD for leading this very important conversation. I thank Senator BLUNT, Senator ERNST, and Senator SASSE for joining us today as well in this discussion.

Mr. President, 28 years ago, I became a first-time dad. By the grace of God, we got to see three more children born after our first child David was born. I can tell you, my wife Cindy and I were excited and a little bit terrified when we welcomed David into the world.

As a parent, one of the toughest things is to see your child in pain. I remember when David cried, I would have given an arm and a leg to stop that pain. I remember when he was just a little baby taking David to the pediatrician to get that shot and so forth, and the pain David felt and the screams and the crying I think were much harder on the parents than on the baby.

I think we all recognize the pain a child feels after they are born. As I have gone on and researched this issue of pain and babies and so forth, science tells us that a baby feels pain before they are born. Senator SASSE mentioned earlier that we are one of four nations that allows elective abortion at any time during a pregnancy. The question is, if we were 1 hour before delivery—the baby is 1 hour from being delivered—as a nation, can we at least agree that we should have a law that says abortions should not be allowed because it is pretty clear that the baby is going to feel pain? The question is, at what point do we know they feel pain during the pregnancy?

It is shocking to think our Nation loses 13,000 children a year to late-term abortions. We can have the debate

about all abortions, but today we are focused on late-term abortions. Thirteen thousand children a year die from late-term abortions. At 20 weeks, these babies can suck their thumb, they can yawn, they can stretch, they can make faces, and science shows these babies are also capable of feeling pain.

Our ears may be deaf to their cries, but we don't have to live in ignorance, not when research and even common sense tells us these unborn children feel pain. In fact, there is a reason unborn babies are oftentimes given anesthesia during fetal surgery. That is why we must pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It is unconscionable that we are allowing unborn children as old as 20 weeks—that is 5 months—to be killed when they can feel pain. In fact, do a Google search. If you have a smartphone, are sitting in front of a computer, type in "20 weeks." You don't even have to type in "baby." Just type in "20 weeks." Then, take a look at the pictures, the images that come up after you complete that search. This is one of them. In fact, I had my smartphone last night. I said to my staff: I typed in "20 weeks" in the Google search, and this is the image that comes up.

How can we say that is not a baby? While much of the media turned a blind eye to the atrocious acts of Kermit Gosnell, and they didn't watch the horrific videos taken undercover at Planned Parenthood clinics, many of us did. We did watch, and we cannot sit in silence. Most of us would not wish that treatment on even our most hated of enemies, let alone a child of any age.

The United States is just one of seven countries that allows elective abortions after 20 weeks. It is not a good list to be on. It is the same list we share that has China and North Korea on it. As an American citizen, I believe in our founding principle that all men and women are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As a person of faith, I am called—we are called—to help the most vulnerable in our society. As a U.S. Senator, it is my honor to support this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there has just been a dialogue—a colloquy—here on the floor. I thank Senator DAINES from Montana, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, Senator ERNST from Iowa, and Senator SASSE from Nebraska for joining in a dialogue of this basic issue of life.

In 1973 this week, *Roe v. Wade* was passed by the Supreme Court in a split decision. We are still having this dialogue, and there is still an ongoing argument about looking into the womb. We know a lot more now—about times now—than they knew in 1973, and we know a lot more about the development of a child now than they knew in 1973. We are still having this ongoing debate that, I think, is a righteous de-

bate, quite frankly. I think it is entirely appropriate for us to be able to talk about these kinds of difficult issues and try to find some resolution. The American people have these dialogues, and we should have them here and be able to bring the debate to the forefront.

This is not about people whom we hate. It is always interesting to be able to get the dialogue and pushback from people who say: You just hate people because of whatever reason. It is not true. It is, actually, that we love children. That is really the issue. There is a vulnerable child in the middle of this conversation, and sometimes they don't seem to come up in the conversation about protecting rights or about giving people privacy. All of those things are wonderful euphemisms, but in the middle of that, there is a very small child who is being discussed. We are trying to elevate their voice—to literally speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. We think that is an appropriate role for government—to speak out for the most vulnerable and see if we can find justice for those individuals.

This week is not only the week that we have the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*; it is also the week that we celebrate Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. I would say that he is a terrific role model in this conversation. His basic teaching is that hate doesn't win over a friend, that only love can do that. Only love can transform an enemy into a friend. That is what we are trying to do.

To the people who oppose this idea, we get it. We can have that dialogue. They are not our enemies, though. Quite frankly, we want to respond to their comments in love and say, "Let's sit down and have a reasonable dialogue. Let's express our affection for children," and be able to talk about how valuable they really are in our society. Let's talk about adoption. Let's talk about ways to be able to continue to take care of them. In the middle of it, let's talk about a child as a child, not just as tissue that is random, because tissue that is just random doesn't suck its thumb and smile back at you. It doesn't stretch and yawn. It is a child who does that. We want to be able to have that conversation.

I would urge this body to stop ignoring what millions of the American people see as the issue. Let's talk about the child, and let's see where we are going to go. I think a good first step for us to be able to talk about this is with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, what we call the pain-capable bill, which deals with late-term abortions—very late, 5 months and later—and the issue of conscience.

Are we really going to compel people to perform procedures they find morally reprehensible in the destruction of a child rather than in the protection of a child? We should be able to find common ground on those.

Let's then keep the conversation going because it is a reasonable thing

for us to be able to discuss. If we cannot talk about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in this place, where can we talk about it?

Again, I thank my colleagues for participating and for their tenacity and their compassion and their affection for all Americans whether they agree or disagree on this issue. I appreciate very much their engagement.

I appreciate very much the volunteers who are scattered around the country right now who are serving women in some of the most difficult moments of their lives at crisis pregnancy centers, at women's resource centers, and other locations. They are volunteering; they are providing clothes; they are providing help; they are providing sonograms and pregnancy tests; and they are walking those families through those tough days. Thanks to those volunteers as well today, wherever they may be, and bless them for the ongoing work that they do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, access to healthcare is on the line today for 24,000 Montana children. The House of Representatives is working to pass legislation that will reauthorize a program called the Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as CHIP, for 6 years and will keep the government open. If passed, it will then come to us for a vote.

Why don't we take the opportunity before us to come together on issues we agree on instead of always fighting on what divides us? I think we can all agree on keeping Montana kids healthy.

Let me tell you a story about a family from Helena, MT, the A-Gee family.

Jaxon was a normal baby—a happy, healthy baby—until October of 2016, when he was just 8 months old. That is when he was first flown from Helena to Missoula's Community Medical Center's Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. He was deathly ill with a respiratory infection.

At that time, it was not clear why Jaxon had gotten so sick, but his parents soon learned that he had Leigh syndrome, a disease in which the body is not able to process energy properly, which leads to muscle weakness, swallowing problems, and severe illnesses with just a simple or a common cold. His parents quickly learned to manage his new feeding tube, to suction his mouth and his throat, and to put him on oxygen monitors at night.

Unfortunately, Jaxon has had five more serious infections. Each time, he has become ill. It has happened so quickly that he has had to be flown to Missoula even though he has a team of pediatricians, nurses, dietitians, speech therapists, and physical therapists who

are trying to help keep him from getting ill.

As Jaxon's mom would say, when Jaxon gets ill, the only way to keep him from having to be flown to Missoula is to get him seen by his pediatrician as soon as possible so that if he does get sick, it is relatively minor.

I can tell you that this family in Montana is grateful for Healthy Montana Kids, which is Montana's CHIP program. They are thankful for its providing Jaxon's insurance and the copay for his care and his medical supplies. His mom says that the insurance is what makes it possible to manage Jaxon's condition and possible to afford well-baby checks instead of their just going to the doctor's on an emergency basis.

To add more background to the story, Jaxon's dad was disabled in a workplace accident, so he is home, caring for Jaxon and the family's other two children. Jaxon's mom works, and her employer has been phenomenal to her—those are her words—as they have faced Jaxon's hospitalizations, but the family of five couldn't afford Jaxon's care without Healthy Montana Kids. A helicopter bill for the ride from Helena to Missoula alone can be as much as \$34,000, and Jaxon has taken that flight six times.

This family doesn't know what it will do if the funding for CHIP runs out, but the family is committed to caring for its son no matter what. That is why I support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP.

Let me provide another reason.

This is Danielle. She is 9 years old, and she lives in Deer Lodge, MT. When she was just 18 months old, she suddenly lost the ability to walk.

Cindy and I are the parents of four children. I cannot imagine a more frightening moment as a parent if one has an 18-month-old child, and he suddenly loses his ability to walk.

Danielle was diagnosed with a form of juvenile arthritis. You don't think about arthritis affecting an 18-month-old child. This is a disease that causes pain, swelling, a stiffness of joints, as well as vision problems.

Thankfully, Danielle was started on a medication—a twice-a-month injection that controls the swelling and inflammation. Because of that, she can walk and even run again. Yet these injections are expensive. To pay outright for just 1 month, it costs over \$6,000. Last summer, for 3 months, Danielle was unable to get the injections. She stopped walking, and she no longer could go to school. Her mom had to carry her through the house.

When Danielle was approved for Montana's CHIP program, she was able to go to the doctor's and get on another medication—an infusion this time. She is now back at school and running around—to quote Mom—“like a kid who doesn't have any problems.” Danielle loves to study math and science, and when she grows up, of all things, her dream is to be a doctor for

kids. Without CHIP, Danielle's family would be unable to afford the medication she needs. Without CHIP, Danielle wouldn't be walking.

Danielle and Jaxon and the thousands of other Montana kids and their families need us to work for them. So I am saddened that partisan politics would get in the way of access to healthcare for these children. We have the opportunity today to reauthorize CHIP for 6 years and avert a government shutdown at the same time.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing here, to do the right thing for the 24,000 Montana kids who use this important program. I urge them to support a 6-year reauthorization of CHIP and to keep the government open.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Vermont.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we are at a pivotal moment. If the Congress does not get its act together by tomorrow, there will be a government shutdown. A government shutdown will be extraordinarily destructive to the people of our country, millions of whom depend upon government services. It will be destructive to millions of Federal employees who keep their families going with a paycheck from the government. It will be destructive to the U.S. Armed Forces, men and women who put their lives on the line to defend us. So it seems to me that we have to do everything we can to prevent a government shutdown.

As everyone knows, we have a Republican Party that controls the U.S. Senate, a Republican Party that controls the U.S. House of Representatives, and a Republican who is in the White House, President Trump. We are now 3½ months into the fiscal year, and the Republican Party has yet to give us an annual budget.

The U.S. Government is a \$3 trillion operation. There is no business in this country of any size that can run week to week, month to month. We need an annual budget, and now the Republicans are coming back, asking for a fourth continuing resolution. You cannot run a government like that. It is unfair to the American people, unfair to the Armed Forces, unfair to all of us.

Three and a half months have gone in the fiscal year; yet the Children's Health Insurance Program has not been reauthorized. This is a program that has existed for decades with bipartisan support. How can we not reauthorize the CHIP Program?

Three and a half months of the fiscal year have come and gone, and we have not reauthorized the Community Health Center Program, which provides primary healthcare, dental care, mental health counseling, low-cost prescription drugs to 27 million Americans

in every State in this country. If legislation were brought to the floor of the Senate today, the Blunt-Stabenow bill reauthorizing the community health centers, I suspect, would get 70, 75 votes; yet Republicans, after 3½ months, have not been able to reauthorize the CHIP Program or the Community Health Center Program.

When we talk about the budget process, we are talking about three major issues; there are more, but there are three major issues. No. 1, will we continue to have parity in spending between defense spending and nondefense spending? Since 2011, in four different budgets, there has been a bipartisan agreement that for every dollar spent on defense is a dollar you will spend on the needs of a struggling middle class, millions of people who are struggling every day to keep their heads above water economically—a dollar here, a dollar there. That has been agreed upon on four separate occasions, but several weeks ago, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, came to the floor and said: We want to do away with that parity. We want to be able to spend more on the military and less on the needs of working families.

We have a middle class that is shrinking. We have people all over this country working two or three jobs. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any other major country on Earth. We have millions of elderly people who can't make it on \$12,000 or \$13,000 a year. We have a crisis sweeping the Nation, hitting my State of Vermont very hard. We have infrastructure that is crumbling. We cannot ignore the needs of the working families of this country and spend huge amounts of money only on the military.

Some of the things we have to do as we come together, as we must, for a bipartisan agreement is, of course, reauthorize CHIP and, of course, reauthorize the Community Health Center Program. The Stabenow-Blunt bill has nine Republican cosponsors. Every Democrat will support it. We have the votes. Let's do it.

We have to deal with the pension issue. One and a half million American workers are about to lose 50 to 60 percent of the pensions they were promised by the U.S. Government. That cannot be allowed to happen. We have to stand with those workers.

I went to a meeting earlier today dealing with the Social Security Administration. The Social Security Administration provides a process—the administrative arm makes sure that the elderly, disabled, and people who get Social Security benefits get those benefits in a timely manner. For years now, Republicans have underfunded that administration, and today there are simply not enough employees to do the work that has to be done. Amazingly enough, over at the House they are talking about massive cuts to the Social Security Administration on top of all the cuts they have already received.

The Washington Post wrote an article a few weeks ago—unbelievable—and what they said is that over the last year, if you can believe it, 10,000 people with disabilities who had applied for Social Security benefits died while waiting for those claims to be processed. They were not processed in a timely manner because the Social Security Administration does not have the workers it needs and has been significantly underfunded. For the sake of the senior citizens of our country, for the sake of the disabled, any budget agreement when we have parity must supply sufficient amounts of money for the Social Security Administration so that they can do their work.

Every Veterans Day, every Member of this body talks about how much they love veterans. The Veterans' Administration today has 30,000 vacancies, which means that our veterans are not getting the quality and timely care that they must be able to receive. We have to start filling those vacancies. Any budget agreement must include increased funding for the VA.

In my State of Vermont and all over this country, there are millions of young people who went to college, went to graduate school, and have left school deeply in debt. Because of high interest rates, some of those people now owe more money today after paying off, year after year, their debts than they did when they took out the debt. We have to address the debt crisis facing some 40 million Americans.

In Vermont and all over this country, if you are a working person, what do you do if you have a 3-year-old or a 2-year-old? Well, you look for decent, quality childcare. But all over this country it is extremely difficult to find that quality childcare. Any serious budget agreement we reach must include increased funding for childcare so that working people in this country know, when they leave their kid at a center, that child will receive quality care at a cost that is affordable. Every dollar we invest in early childhood education is a dollar very, very well spent.

All over this country, in this, the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world, we have infrastructure—roads, bridges, water systems, waste water plants—which is crumbling. In many parts of rural America, including the State of Vermont, we do not have high-quality, affordable broadband or cell phone service. How do you maintain a community, how do you bring business into a community, how do kids do their homework if you don't have decent broadband or cell phone service? We have to invest in rural America and make certain that every community in this country has broadband and the kind of infrastructure that it needs in order to prosper.

One of the tragedies taking place in this country today is resulting, unbelievably, in a lowered life expectancy rate here in the United States of America. Our life expectancy rate is actually in decline, and one of the reasons

for that is the tragic opioid and heroin epidemic, which claimed some 60,000 lives last year. We cannot ignore that problem. We have to invest in prevention. We have to invest in treatment. We have to help States all over this country and the families who are struggling with this issue.

My point is, we need parity, not for some abstract, inside-the-beltway reason; we need parity in spending because we need more in this country than just a strong military. We need a strong middle class. We need a strong working class. We cannot turn our backs on tens of millions of people who are struggling.

The second issue that we have to deal with here in the Congress is the issue of DACA and the need for clean Dreamers legislation. In September, President Trump initiated a very serious crisis. What he did is rescind President Obama's Executive order providing legal status through DACA to 800,000 young people. These are young people who were raised in the United States of America. These are young people who today are working. They are in school; they are in the military. This is the only home they have ever known. This is the only country that any of them or many of them can even remember. The idea of simply doing away with the legal status that they have, subjecting them to deportation, subjecting them to being taken away from the only country they have ever known and loved is literally beyond comprehension and unspeakable.

In September, when Trump initiated this process by rescinding Obama's Executive order on DACA, he said to the Congress, the Republican leadership in the House and Senate: You fix it. Get legislation.

Well, there are people right now—Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and others—who are working on legislation, which doesn't go as far as I would like it to go, but they are working on serious legislation in the House. The vast majority of Democrats and many Republicans understand that we cannot turn our backs on these young people. That is not just what we feel here in the House and in the Senate; it is what the American people want. Poll after poll shows that 70, 75, 80 percent of the American people say: Provide these 800,000 young people with legal status. Provide them with a path toward citizenship. Very few people think that we should turn our backs on these young people, let DACA expire, and subject them to deportation. Let us do what the American people want us to do, and let us pass a strong Dreamers Act.

Last but not least, we had some terrible hurricanes some months ago. They brought a lot of disaster to Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Months have gone by, and we have yet to pass the kind of disaster relief that communities in those States and territories desperately need.

We cannot continue to kick the can down the road. We cannot continue to

run a \$3 trillion government on a month-by-month basis. It is unfair to everybody. We have to sit down and negotiate a serious budget agreement. And what Republicans must understand is that, yes, they have a 51-to-49 majority here in the Senate, but you need 60 votes to pass this type of legislation. You need 60 votes, and that means you cannot do it alone. You cannot give the Democratic caucus a fait accompli and expect Democrats to say: Oh, yes, sir, we are going to follow you. This requires bipartisan discussion on the parity issue and domestic spending and bipartisan discussion on DACA.

We have a strong majority of Members of the Senate who support a Dreamers piece of legislation and a path toward citizenship. We have a strong majority of the American people and a strong majority of Members of the Senate who want disaster relief. This should not be a difficult problem. The American people want a resolution, and they want it done in a bipartisan way. Let's do it. Let's not kick the can down the road. Republicans must understand that they must negotiate in a bipartisan way.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the University of Alabama's Crimson Tide on the 2018 College Football Playoff National Championship victory against the University of Georgia Bulldogs.

I join the University of Alabama, the Crimson Tide Faithful, and the entire State of Alabama—my State—in commending this team on its hard-fought win and for showing perseverance in the midst of adversity time and time again. This year, the Tide overcame a host of injuries and midseason struggles to reach this achievement. The team even had to overcome, as the Presiding Officer will recall, a 13-point deficit in the second half of the championship game in Atlanta, winning ultimately 26 to 23 in the first overtime in a college football playoff national championship game. What a game.

Under Head Coach Nick Saban's leadership, the Crimson Tide fought to earn its fifth national title since 2009—demonstrating, I believe, nearly 10 years of dominance. This year's team, among other things, won various awards.

Minkah Fitzpatrick, who is a safety, won the Bednarik Award for best defensive player in the Nation and the Thorpe Award for best defensive back in the Nation. He was also named Associated Press First Team All-American.

Bradley Bozeman, an offensive lineman, was named AP Second Team All-American.

Jonah Williams, an offensive lineman, was named AP Third Team All-American.

Additionally, five players on the University of Alabama's football team were named First Team All-SEC.

Head Coach Nick Saban has now won six college football national championships, equaling the record of former Alabama football Head Coach Paul "Bear" Bryant. The Crimson Tide coaching staff has helped produce high-caliber student athletes and gentlemen. This team has brought great pride to the University of Alabama, the loyal fans of the Crimson Tide, and to the entire State of Alabama.

I would like to take a minute to thank Crimson Tide Head Coach Nick Saban, Athletic Director Greg Byrne, President Stuart Bell, and Chancellor Ray Hayes for their leadership.

Mr. President, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 375, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 375) congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 375) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, constituents of mine are hearing today

that there is a looming government shutdown—Friday at midnight; that if Congress hasn't passed a spending bill, it is possible the government could shut down. That would be a big mistake. Government shutdowns do not make sense.

We have legislation called End Government Shutdowns, by the way, which says that when Congress doesn't do their appropriations bills on time—which is never or rarely—that there should not be a shutdown; rather, continue the spending from the previous year, but ratchet it down over time to give the Appropriations Committee and Congress and the Senate an incentive to get the job done. But let's not shut down the government. When we do that, it doesn't help anybody. It doesn't help us as taxpayers because we end up coming back and paying people, and the inefficiencies of it create more costs. So I hope we are not even talking about that.

In the so-called continuing resolution, which is a short-term spending bill—which, again, is not the best way to govern, but that is what our choice is—in that continuing resolution to keep the government from shutting down, there is also, as I understand it, going to be something that is very good for our country. So, one, shutting down doesn't make sense, but two, let's be sure that the short-term spending bill that we do pass includes something very important—important to about 219,000 children in my home State of Ohio and millions of families around the country who depend on a program called the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP.

CHIP has traditionally been a bipartisan program. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike. In fact, the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, came out of the Finance Committee with a vote that was unanimous—Republicans and Democrats alike. Again, that doesn't happen often. It happened because people believe it is important to have that safety net program for our kids and for those families.

Right now, that program is really on life support. We are told that if we do not extend that program, some States will begin running out of money even in the next few weeks. One of those States could be Ohio, we are told. The numbers are not exactly accurate, I don't think, because nobody knows. That makes it very unpredictable and uncertain for those families and children. We know there are States running out of money right now.

By the way, the program ended in September, and since September 30, it has been given these short-term authorizations. That doesn't make sense.

My understanding is that the House of Representatives is going to actually put into the continuing resolution that they are going to send over here a longer term extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program—in fact, a

6-year extension, which would be the longest extension ever. I think that is very important.

I heard from some families last week in Ohio who are wondering: Are you guys going to actually provide us with the certainty that our kids can continue to receive the treatment they are getting?

These are children who have serious health problems and who need that kind of care and rely on CHIP to provide it.

For all the disagreements we have in this Chamber—and there are plenty of them—there will be healthy and spirited debate on lots of issues later today, I am sure. This is one on which we can come together and agree that children should have that basic healthcare.

I came to the Senate floor last month—back in December—to strongly urge my colleagues and the leadership on both sides of the aisle to take the politics out of this and get CHIP done, get the long-term authorization done, in the last spending bill. That was not done. In fact, it was just a short-term extension of CHIP that basically coincides with the spending bills. That was disappointing. I said so at the time. It was not done last time. That was a mistake. Now we have the opportunity to do it. Let's take that opportunity. I am here to once again say, let's act to provide that long-term stability in the program.

Again, I am encouraged by what I hear—that the House of Representatives is likely to include that stability to ensure that children everywhere can receive adequate and affordable healthcare. The House 6-year extension would also return CHIP to a traditional Federal-State partnership, which has been a bipartisan effort, and provide additional protections for low-income children and more flexibility for the States.

There are some changes to the program and some reforms to the program that have been bipartisan through committee, and I am hopeful that will be part of it as well.

The House bill that includes this CHIP extension—it would be the longest extension since the creation of the program more than 20 years ago. Instead of these short-term ones, we are going to have a long-term extension, if we can pass this. By doing it long term, the Congressional Budget Office says we will actually save taxpayers \$1 billion. Having that predictability and certainty—not having the start-and-stop nature of CHIP—saves taxpayers money.

Is this CR perfect in terms of healthcare? No. There are other things we should do as well. We can do that with regard to the longer term spending bill we will probably be doing a couple of weeks from now or a few weeks from now or whenever we come to the end of whatever the continuing resolution is tomorrow.

We do need to find long-term funding solutions for community health cen-

ters, for instance. Again, that has been bipartisan in the past. These centers have been very effective in dealing with issues that relate to our communities, health issues, such as opioid addiction. Community health centers have been very helpful in providing treatment to people, particularly in rural areas that don't have access to other healthcare treatment centers. We should provide them with that long-term funding and certainty.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote to extend these important health insurance programs for our children. Again, CHIP stands for Children's Health Insurance Program. It should not be a bargaining chip for other political purposes. Let's get that done. This is a chance for everybody to ensure that we have that certainty for our children and help them to live up to their God-given potential in life.

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to talk about another vulnerable group of Americans. This is an issue that doesn't relate to the looming government shutdown or the spending bill that will avoid that shutdown, but it relates to another issue that Congress has the opportunity to address this month.

January is Human Trafficking Prevention Month. Last Thursday was National Human Trafficking Awareness Day. We had a lot of people here in town talking about that issue.

I think everybody in this Chamber would agree with me that we live in a great country. We are blessed to be Americans. In this age of rapid scientific, medical, and technological innovation, we have been able to change the world in positive ways. That is good. But something else is happening that is discouraging; that is, in this country, in the 21st century, we are actually seeing an increase in a part of human trafficking, and that is heart-breaking. This is sex trafficking that is occurring in our country. Often it involves children, underage, who are being sold much like property. Experts tell us that this increase is happening primarily for one reason and one reason alone, and that is because of the internet. It is sort of the dark side of the internet. It is a ruthlessly efficient way to conduct this trafficking business.

This is a stain on our national character. It is something we should all be involved with, Republican and Democrat alike, all of us as Americans, to say: Let's push back. Let's not allow our country, during this period of so many positive technological changes, to use this technology—in this case, online websites selling people—in a way that devastates these families and creates so many dislocations in our communities. Traffickers are using the internet because of the fact that Con-

gress—the House and the Senate—passed legislation 21 years ago that they are able to hide behind. They have immunity under the Federal law called the Communications Decency Act. Ironically, it was actually put in place to push back against child pornography—in other words, to protect children from viewing pornography. It is being used now to say: Well, we don't have responsibilities as websites even if we knowingly are selling children online. Can you imagine that?

Our legislation to deal with that is something we have been working on for a couple of years. We had a 2-year investigation on this online trafficking. It focused a lot on one website—an evil website that sells people online and knowingly has been providing ads out there for underage girls and boys—backpage.com. As we looked into it and did more research, it became clear that even though they were doing this and even though there were people suing them because of it, none of the lawsuits were successful—whether from prosecutors or victims, whether criminal suits or civil suits—because of this immunity they were claiming under Federal law.

We found out that backpage.com—this one website—was responsible for about 75 percent of all child trafficking reports that the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children was receiving. In other words, the great majority of this was happening on this one website. We found out there has been a dramatic increase in trafficking because of this ruthless online efficiency.

When we got through our investigation, we also found out that this website actually knew that some of these ads were related to children and yet published them anyway. They went so far as to try to, as they called it, “clean” the ads for illegal transactions. Someone would place an ad, pay for the ad, and then backpage would say: You need to change this ad a little bit because you are using words like “schoolgirl” or “cheerleader,” which indicates they are underage.

In other words, they knew these kids were underage. Yet they edited the ads and placed the ads anyway and took the profit. That is what we are up against.

The cost to these families, the human suffering that results from this, is incalculable. I met with victims all around the State of Ohio and some from other States who have come here, as they did last week for this rally. Can you imagine being in that situation as a parent?

Kubiiki Pride, who was here last week, had her 14-year-old daughter go missing. She was a teenager. Her mom was stricken with grief and concern over her. After 10 weeks, she couldn't find her anywhere. Finally, somebody said: You ought to look on this website called backpage because they are selling girls online. God forbid, they were right, and she found her daughter. She

found several photographs of her daughter—not photographs she wanted to see, but on the other hand, there was her daughter alive. She said: My first reaction was relief that she was alive. Then, of course, I called backpage, and I said: I found my daughter. She is on your site. She is 14 years old. Please take her ad down.

Backpage said: Did you pay for the ad?

She said: No, I didn't pay for the ad. That is my daughter. She is 14 years old.

They said: No, we can't take down the ad. You didn't pay for it.

Can you imagine?

She was eventually reunited with her daughter. And there is a film called "I am Jane Doe" in which she and other women, mothers and young women, are featured. You can see more about her story and what a brave woman she is because she is now standing up to it. She filed a lawsuit, but the lawsuit was not successful because the judge said there is this immunity.

By the way, the courts that have ruled that these websites are protected by this Federal law have said that Congress ought to do something about that. Most recently, last August, a Sacramento judge dropped charges against backpage, stating: "If and until Congress sees fit to amend the immunity law, the broad reach of section 230 of the Communications Decency Act even applies to those alleged to support the exploitation of others by human trafficking."

To me that is an invitation for Congress to act, saying: We get it; they are exploiting human beings online, but this Federal law gives them immunity.

This immunity was put in place 21 years ago in an effort to try to ensure that we could have a free internet, and that is very important, but it was never intended to provide immunity to illegal activity like this—certainly not to keep people in the business of sex trafficking.

That injustice is why we introduced our legislation. It is called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act, or SESTA. I introduced it with Senators BLUMENTHAL, MCCAIN, MCCASKILL, CORNYN, HEITKAMP, and others. Senators THUNE and NELSON took this bill through the Commerce Committee late last year.

We had a spirited debate in that committee, and it ended up coming out of the committee with a unanimous vote. Why? Because after hearing from the victims, after hearing from the experts on both sides, the Senators said: Whoa. This doesn't make any sense. As Senators, it is our responsibility to change this law.

It provides justice for victims of online sex trafficking because they will have the opportunity to sue. It holds these websites accountable that knowingly facilitate crimes. It also helps in terms of prosecutions because the State prosecutors now—the AGs, the local prosecutors at the State level—

will be able to have access now to the courts to be able to take on these websites and, again, hold them accountable. The prosecutions, again, have been thwarted because of this immunity.

These are very narrow changes. They don't affect the freedom of the internet at all. In fact, I would argue it helps to ensure a free internet. To take care of these bad actors and by holding these folks accountable, it is going to provide the justice the victims deserve.

It is a fair and commonsense approach, and that is why it has the support not just of the Members I have mentioned but actually, now, 66 or 67 Members of the U.S. Senate. That is out of 100 Members. That is a rare thing to have that kind of support. It has the majority of the Republicans on board. It has the majority of the Democrats on board.

It is a fair and commonsense approach that is going to make a real difference in the lives of the people we represent. It will be effective at curbing this increase in trafficking that we see online. Every day we don't act, there are more women and more children who are being trafficked unnecessarily.

It also has the support of an extraordinary coalition of law enforcement organizations, anti-trafficking advocates, survivors, faith-based groups, civil rights communities, major businesses, and even some members of the tech community that initially pushed back against this legislation. Looking at it, I think many of them realized this is not a defensible position to say we shouldn't amend this Federal law that is providing immunity to these bad actors.

Members of the U.S. Senate who have cosponsored the bill, including colleagues of mine who are in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, are saying: I want to be part of the solution. They are showing some courage, and I appreciate that. People who have really shown courage are these survivors—these children and these women who have been trafficked—and they need our help.

We need 60 votes to pass most things around here. In this case, we will have some objections, apparently, and so having 66 or 67 supporters of this legislation is a key number. It enables us to ensure that we can get this onto the floor and passed on the floor. So why are we waiting? We shouldn't wait. We should move this month, during Human Trafficking Awareness Month, Human Trafficking Prevention Month. We should move because it is the right thing to do for these victims and those who might be victims between now and when we act. It is the right thing to do because it will create a safer and a better and a more just society. Elected officials like us are elected to do just that.

There were hundreds of sex trafficking survivors on Capitol Hill last week, and I met with them. The stories

will break your heart. Some were the parents, some were trafficking victims themselves. They have shown great courage by sharing their stories, bringing their tragedy public, and now we owe them the opportunity to get this legislation passed, to ensure that we can protect some of the most vulnerable among us.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Indiana.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that is very important to Hoosiers: protecting our unborn children. Right now, Hoosiers from across the State of Indiana are traveling to Washington, DC, to take part in tomorrow's March for Life. This annual event brings together the unsung heroes of the life movement—those who have dedicated their lives to saving innocent children.

Now, despite what is often portrayed in the media, life-affirming principles are supported by a majority of Americans. A poll by POLITICO and the Harvard T.H. Chan School for Public Health showed that 58 percent of Americans—almost three in five Americans—oppose allowing Medicaid funding to be used for abortion.

According to the Quinnipiac University polling, 60 percent of Americans, including 46 percent of Democrats, support Federal legislation limiting abortion after 20 weeks.

I am proud to cosponsor the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This act would protect unborn children at 20 weeks postfertilization—the point at which scientific evidence proves abortion inflicts pain.

It is estimated that this commonsense legislation will save roughly 12,000 to 18,000 babies annually, and it will not apply, incidentally, to cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at risk.

Before being elected to the U.S. Senate, I sat on the board of directors of Hannah House. This is in Bloomington, IN, where I live. It offers women loving support during pregnancy.

I further spent 2 years as a smalltown attorney in little Paoli, IN, and I offered free legal services for parents who wanted to adopt. So you can see why I am very passionate about helping children find loving homes and helping caring adults become parents. I have seen firsthand, through my own experiences, the importance of advocating for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

The United States is one of only seven countries in the world that allows abortions after 20 weeks. This list includes human rights violators like China and North Korea. This isn't company we want to keep.

During this time, when there is principled disagreement on so many

issues—Republicans disagreeing with Democrats, conservatives disagreeing with progressives, surely, we can come together and take action that a significant majority of Americans want. So I am hopeful this critical legislation will receive a vote on the Senate floor very soon.

Thank you.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the Senate and the House right now are struggling to pass yet another short-term continuing resolution to avoid a Federal shutdown at midnight on Friday. For nine consecutive years now, since I have gotten to the Senate, we have begun the fiscal year without regular appropriations bills being enacted into law. If we pass another continuing resolution this week, it will be the fourth continuing resolution for fiscal year 2018. There were three CRs, or continuing resolutions, for fiscal year 2017. This “government by CR” is chaotic and it is disruptive. It is inflicting real damage on our Armed Forces, as well as on critical domestic programs that benefit people across this country.

I live in a very small town in New Hampshire called Madbury, and if our board of selectmen in Madbury committed this kind of budgetary malpractice, we would get rid of them.

The fact is that the frantic scramble to pass a new CR by midnight on Friday is yet another manufactured crisis here in Washington. It is a crisis that is completely unnecessary. The Appropriations Committees in both Houses of Congress have completed their work in a thoughtful, timely manner. In this Congress, the House passed all 12 of its appropriations bills out of committee. In the Senate, the Appropriations Committee passed 8 of our 12 bills, and we did that with overwhelming bipartisan support. The only reason we didn't report the other four bills out of committee is because the leadership directed us to stop.

So let's be very clear. This is not about appropriators not being able to get our work done and not being able to agree on what we want to do. This is about the leadership in Congress—the Republican majority—which has refused to allow us to go forward with a regular order budget process. The House, the Senate, and the White House are all controlled by Republicans, and if they wanted to complete the appropriations process in a timely manner, we could have done so, and we could have done it with bipartisan support.

Now, I am especially concerned about the damage that government by CR is inflicting on our Armed Forces and national security. Those of us who serve on the Armed Services Committee were disturbed by testimony from the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM John Richardson, in September of 2016. He said: “Our ability to achieve true effectiveness and efficiency has been undermined by budget instability, workforce limitations, and eight—now likely nine”—and it was nine—“straight years of budget uncertainty and continuing resolutions.”

I remember when Admiral Richardson came and spoke to the Navy caucus, and we were asking him what his concerns were. He said: Well, you know, my biggest concern is budget certainty, and what we tell everybody in the Navy now to figure on is to figure that they can't do anything in the first quarter of a fiscal year because they are going to be operating under a continuing resolution.

He pointed out: “This compromises our mission, and drives inefficiency and waste into all that we do.”

In a similar vein, the Army Chief of Staff, GEN Mark Milley, has repeatedly warned us of the damaging impacts that budget uncertainty has on the Army's combat readiness. Training cycles are disrupted, and sometimes they are discontinued. All non-mission-critical maintenance is postponed for the length of a CR.

Now, I share the views of many in this Congress that we need to increase support for our military. We live in an uncertain world, where we are facing security threats from ISIS to Russia and North Korea, and we could go down a long list. We must be prepared to respond, but we can't increase military spending at the expense of funding our domestic needs.

When it comes to funding domestic needs, no challenge is more urgent and frightening than the nationwide opioid epidemic. In my State of New Hampshire, nearly everyone has a heart-breaking story of a family member, a friend, or a colleague whose life has been destroyed by opioids. We can just look at these headlines and see what the challenge is. This is on August 16, 2017, from our State newspaper, the Concord Monitor, in the capital: “N.H. drug overdose deaths—mostly from fentanyl—continue at a high rate.”

The CDC recently said that New Hampshire has the highest overdose death rate from fentanyl, the third highest in the country. Nationwide, in 2016, more than 63,000 Americans died from overdoses—more than 63,000 people. If we were losing that many Americans to a disease outbreak, to a war in the Middle East or elsewhere, there would be an outcry in Congress and we would pass legislation to address the crisis in a matter of days. Well, this current funding crisis is an opportunity for us to address the opioid epidemic.

In recent weeks, along with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator

HASSAN, I have urged the Senate to make an immediate emergency \$25 billion Federal investment in treatment and prevention—a down payment on a sustained, reliable funding stream to support efforts by States and communities. At long last, we could provide a response that is commensurate with the magnitude of this public health crisis.

There is bipartisan support in this body and throughout Congress to address the opioid epidemic. President Trump promised when he was campaigning, and since he became President, that he was going to work to end this epidemic. Yet we are still waiting to see the resources that States and communities need.

Now, last week many of us watched with great anticipation when President Trump invited bipartisan representatives from both the House and Senate, and the television cameras, to talk about how we were going to address the funding situation that we are in, and how we were going to address DACA—those young people who were brought to this country through no fault of their own and are now in a situation where they don't have citizenship and they don't have a way forward.

Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN spent four months negotiating an excellent, bipartisan agreement to strengthen border security and to give Dreamers the path to citizenship that they deserve. The President, in that meeting that we all watched said: Bring me a solution, and I will sign it.

Well, they reached an agreement that would likely pass in the Senate with at least 60 votes. Last week, President Trump applauded the deal. He invited Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN to the White House to finalize it. And when they got there, they were shocked to find that the President had completely reversed himself.

This morning, Senator GRAHAM was stating the obvious when he said: “We do not have a reliable partner in the White House.”

Well, we do have reliable partners in this body. Give us that bill. Let us vote on it. Let's send it to the President, and let the President veto it if he doesn't like it.

Yesterday, Majority Leader MCCONNELL said: “As soon as the President figures out what he is for, then I will be convinced that we are not just spinning our wheels but actually dealing with a bill that can become law.”

Well, again, we have a bipartisan deal on DACA. Let's vote on it.

There are very real consequences to the constant chaos, turmoil, and policy reversals that have become the new normal under this President. We must commit ourselves on a bipartisan basis to restoring order to the appropriations process. It is time to fulfill our constitutional responsibility to pass full-year appropriations bills that address the needs of the American people.

As we work to resolve this current fiscal impasse, any agreement should include a number of basic provisions.

We should fund government for the remainder of this year—no more short-term continuing resolutions—enough. It is enough. We need to stop that. The majority of Members in this Chamber and throughout Congress understand that we can't keep doing this. Any deal should increase support for our military, and it should provide parity for our domestic needs: to address the opioid epidemic; for our veterans; for the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers; for those Medicaid payments that are so critical to our rural hospitals; for disaster relief in Florida, Texas, California, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and for pension relief for people who have worked their whole lives and who are facing old age without the pensions they paid into.

We can get this done. There are enough people of goodwill on both sides of the aisle in this body and in the other body so that we can do this if we are allowed to work together. So Democrats and Republicans, let's get this done. Let's keep the government funded, and let's show the American people that we can work together in the interests of this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Should the Children's Health Insurance Program be reauthorized? Of course it should be reauthorized. It has a long history of strong bipartisan support. This is a major issue in reaching the point of whether we need to get something passed—and we do need to get something passed so the government doesn't shut down. In regard to the Children's Health Insurance Program being a part of that, this started very early last fall, when the Senate Finance Committee overwhelmingly passed a 5-year extension from that committee, once again stating the strong bipartisan support that the Children's Health Insurance Program has.

Thankfully, it is moving along in the House of Representatives. That body has included a 6-year extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program in the continuing resolution that we have to get through the U.S. Senate. That 6-year extension would be the longest extension of the program since it was created over 20 years ago.

I am sure this is going to be surprising to our constituents, for sure, and maybe even surprising to Members of this body, but this reauthorization of 6 years actually saves \$1 billion.

I cannot believe that we are in a situation where people who have said that they support the Children's Health Insurance Program would vote against its reauthorization when the House res-

olution comes over here, but that is what the leadership of this body is dealing with. The reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program has been elevated in this debate, so people know that those who have been crying for a long period of time about finally having CHIP reauthorized could be in a situation of voting against what they have been pleading for over a long period of time.

My colleague from the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator FEINSTEIN, said: "Healthcare coverage for kids should be a no-brainer." I agree. This Children's Health Insurance Program reauthorization is a no-brainer, both in the value it has for the kids and in saving us money at this point.

Senators WARNER and Kaine from Virginia wrote: "We ask that you include bipartisan legislation reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program in any upcoming funding legislation." Well, it is here for all of those Senators who want the Children's Health Insurance Program reauthorized. This is the opportunity to reauthorize it.

Will you vote against what you have been advocating for a long time—the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program? In my State of Iowa, 68,792 children—the latest enrollment—are in CHIP and are depending upon Congress to do the right thing. The right thing to do is to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program as soon as possible—which could be today or tomorrow—for 6 years so that we don't have to deal with it for a long period of time.

My fellow Senators, this is a time for statesmanship, not gamesmanship. It is time to vote for a prompt reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

TAX REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak about a tax issue. It was nearly 3 weeks ago that the President signed into law the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. It is the most sweeping reform of our Tax Code in more than three decades. This tax reform provides both tax simplification and tax cuts for the vast majority of taxpayers.

Importantly, the tax reform bill made good on its commitment to provide real relief to small business owners, and that also includes family farmers and ranchers. As one of only three Republican Senators on both the Finance Committee and the Agriculture Committee, it was a priority of mine to represent agriculture and the family farm institution throughout the tax reform debate.

Fair treatment for farmers under tax reform was especially important to me, given the large role agriculture plays in the economy of the State of Iowa. Ag accounts for one out of every five jobs in the State and makes up 33 percent of Iowa's economy. The tax reform bill provided a once-in-a-generation op-

portunity to make real and long-lasting reforms for farmers, ranchers, and every American working in our agricultural industry.

Broadly speaking, across the board, rate reductions will let Americans keep more of their own money. This will afford farmers the opportunity to reinvest in their operations instead of sending that financial capital to politicians in Washington.

Tax reform legislation expands section 179 of the Tax Code, which helps farmers finance overhead costs. It enables farmers to deduct more expenses in the year they occurred and also expands the availability of cash accounting to more farmers in Iowa and throughout the country. These provisions will allow farmers to invest in the equipment necessary to do the job of feeding the Nation and the world.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act lowers taxes on capital investment and includes a business income deduction, which will help level the playing field between farms that file as corporations and those that file as individuals. More than 94 percent of farms are taxed under the IRS provisions affecting individual taxpayers. The bulk of agriculture producers who operate outside the corporate tax code deserve basic fairness. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act makes sure that those taxed under the individual and corporate tax codes are treated with more equity.

One of the most frequently discussed issues in tax reform discussion is the estate tax, which can force family farms to break up operations to pay the IRS following the death of family members. That doesn't happen at the death of a lot of farmers, but in a few cases it does, and it seems to me to be very unfair to break up a farming operation to pay as a result of the consequence of death. I support a full repeal of this unfair tax, but was pleased that in this tax reform legislation we were able to make significant progress in alleviating its burden on family farmers by doubling the estate tax exemption. This substantial change would let more family farmers pass their hard-earned life's work on to their children, paving the way for the next generation of family farmers.

According to the Iowa Farm Bureau, given the price of farmland, about 30 percent of crop farms in Iowa exceeded the \$5 million estate tax exemption in 2016, based on land values. The doubling of the exemption amount will go a long way toward alleviating the nightmare that is the death tax for many Iowa farmers.

I have long advocated for common-sense tax relief measures because they will help Iowa and the Midwest and will make life easier for middle-class Americans.

Farmers' hard work provides the healthy and affordable food that we so often take for granted. We should do everything in our power to support that segment of our economy and create an environment where these small

businesses and hard-working families can thrive and prosper. That is what tax reform will do for farmers, for Iowans, and for all Americans. Whether they are middle-class farmers or middle-class nonfarmers, all will benefit from other provisions of the tax bill, such as doubling the standard deduction, doubling the child tax credit, reducing the 15-percent bracket to 12, reducing the 25-percent bracket to 22, and there are a lot of other features in this bill to benefit not only farmers but also other middle-class families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DACA AND TPS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the Dreamers are part of this country. They are America's future. They are helping to build this great Nation, and they need our attention now.

The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House. One of their principal responsibilities is to pass a budget. We are now 4 months into the fiscal year and we don't have a budget and we are talking about another continuing resolution through mid-February.

A couple weeks ago, we were told on the floor to give it a couple more weeks and we would work some of these issues out, but that time has now come, and we still do not have a budget. We should not be going into February without dealing with the problems of this country. We need a deal on the budget. We need a deal for an agreement on the Dreamers. We have so many issues that need to be addressed. There is no excuse why the Republican leadership has not brought these issues to the floor of the Senate for action.

I want to start, in regard to the Dreamers, by commending the bipartisan work of a group convened by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN. They have come up with a good plan that addresses key issues needed for a compromise on immigration reform. I was pleased to see they put on their website a summary of the proposed legislation that deals with the Dreamers. It deals with border security, deals with diversity visas, those who are in temporary protective status, and family reunification and migration.

The draft legislation we saw would provide a 12-year pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, with up to 2 years of credit for time with DACA. The qualified Dreamers must have entered the United States by June 15, 2012, when President Obama and the Department of Homeland Security announced the creation of the DACA Program. I think most of us know DACA stands for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program.

Let me just talk a few minutes about the Dreamers. These are individuals who entered our country as minors, when they were brought here by their

parents to seek a better life. Under the DACA Program, they were entitled to a 2-year renewable work permit and the ability to remain in this country without fear of deportation. Each one has to go through a criminal background check. They need to be enrolled in school. They must either be high school graduates or in the U.S. military.

In the United States today, we have 800,000 who are registered under the Dreamers. There are about 10,000 in my State of Maryland, and they are contributing half a billion dollars to Maryland's gross domestic product. They are a key part of our economy. They are the next generation of teachers, doctors, engineers, and entrepreneurs. They are going to help build America. Most know no other country but the United States, which is their home, and our values, which make America the great Nation it is.

We are a welcoming country. We are a country in which people have come over the years to build this great Nation. That is America's strength. Let us build on our strength, not run away from it. Are we going to turn our back now on the values that built this country? Are we going to rip families apart? Is that what America stands for? I find that hard to imagine.

At the same time, we would hurt our economy and hurt ourselves. I have met with many Dreamers in Maryland. We had one in my office a few weeks ago who had tears in her eyes. She said: I have an expiration date on my back. She doesn't know what is going to happen when that date occurs. To me—and I hope to all Americans—this country is not a country where someone should have to live under those fears. We need to take action to help the Dreamers.

I have had several roundtable discussions with Dreamers in Maryland. I had them in College Park, Baltimore, and other areas throughout Maryland. Let me just mention two Dreamers I met with. Adam was originally born in Canada. His family grew up in Pakistan. He came to the United States with his parents when he was very young. Becky—who was born in Peru—came here with her parents to the United States. I mention them collectively because they both attend the University of Maryland, College Park.

Our State allows Dreamers to have in-state tuition to go to college and get the tools they need in order to succeed. They need work permits because they have to work; otherwise, they never would have been able to get through school. They need a driver's license. Adam explained to me he needed a driver's license to get to a magnet school so he could advance his own education.

That was all possible—the ability to get a driver's license and the ability to work—because of President Obama's Executive order, the DACA Program. Now all of that has been put in doubt because of President Trump's an-

nouncement that the program will end. It puts their lives on hold in fear, and they wonder whether they need to go into the shadows of the United States of America.

This is a crisis which was created by President Trump when he announced the end of the DACA Program in 6 months. That will expire in March. President Trump's actions to rescind the DACA Program are wrong. We can correct it. That is what Congress can do and what we must do.

Our university community in Maryland strongly supports the DACA Program. I have heard from the University of Maryland system, Johns Hopkins University, and many other schools in our State. This fall, I received a joint letter from the public school secondary systems of Prince George's County, Anne Arundel County, Howard County, Montgomery County, and Baltimore City. This is what the school superintendents wrote to me:

Maryland is a national leader in providing students with a world-class education. Essential to our success is our commitment to providing children in our schools with a safe and welcoming environment to learn. Termination of DACA will have direct and damaging effects on the Maryland students who are current beneficiaries.

The schools' letter continues:

It is a direct threat to Maryland's economic stability and safety, as it will strip students of their ability to work and drive legally, pay taxes, and pursue post-secondary opportunities. Parents who lose work authorizations will face deportation or be moved into a dangerous underground economy, causing financial uncertainty for their families and harmful stress on their children—our students.

In addition, the DACA decision could impact our ability to motivate our youth to remain committed to their education and pursuing college or careers, and will lead to worsening economic hardships of our DACA community.

This is from our school systems in Maryland.

I heard similar concerns from law enforcement officials. Tom Manger, who cochairs the Law Enforcement Immigration Task Force and is the police chief in Montgomery County, wrote:

Our support for a legislative solution for Dreamers is consistent with our longstanding support for bipartisan reform of our immigration system. We support measures allowing law-abiding people to feel safe and secure in their communities, which reinforce trust and cooperation with state and local law enforcement. Beyond the significant contributions Dreamers make to our communities, we are concerned that, absent action by Congress, the Dreamer population will be driven back into the shadows and be hesitant to report crimes and cooperate with investigations. Such an outcome would risk undermining community safety. When Dreamers, and all immigrants, feel safe engaging with local police, all of our communities are safer.

I certainly agree with Chief Manger.

A group similar to the Dreamers are those who are here in temporary protected status, or TPS. There are 437,000 people in America from El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Somalia,

Sudan, South Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. In Maryland, 22,500 people are here from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. The largest number is from El Salvador. Our TPS population in Maryland exceeds the DACA population. My own State's recipients contributed \$1.2 billion to the gross domestic product of my State, so this is a major part of the Maryland economy.

This is a very similar situation to the Dreamers. They get a 6- to 18-month extension. They have been here for decades because the underlying conditions in the countries from which they came still exist. I have been to Central America. I can tell you that it is not safe for people to return to those gang communities. They have the same situation—they know no other country but America. If they are required to go back to the country in which they were born, it will tear families apart. We need to act. We need to act in order to protect this group of citizens.

I want to acknowledge legislation that was introduced. I join my colleagues, Senators VAN HOLLEN, FEINSTEIN, and others, who will provide a legislative fix, S. 2144, the SECURE Act. I am pleased that the outline of the Durbin-Graham compromise immigration legislation includes relief for TPS recipients. The legislation will make changes to the diversity visa lottery program and reallocate half of the annual visas to recipients of TPS. That would amount to about 27,000 visas annually.

Under the draft, TPS recipients would maintain legal status and work authorization while awaiting visas. This would give TPS recipients protection from deportation, work authorizations, green cards, and ultimately a pathway to citizenship. After the TPS backlog is cleared—which could take roughly a decade to do, given the 300,000-plus recipients of TPS in the United States today—the annual visas would be allocated to nationals of priority countries.

In the past few months, the Department of Homeland Security has placed termination dates on TPS for those from El Salvador and Haiti and has extended the deadline for a decision on Honduras. These individuals are at risk. We need to act.

Maryland has a large number of El Salvadorans. I am gravely concerned about what will happen to these individuals—many mixed-nationality families who have been part of American communities for so long. For nearly a decade, El Salvador has consistently suffered per capita murder rates that have been among the worst in the world. In 2016, the people of El Salvador were victims of over 5,200 homicides—an alarming rate of more than 80 per 100,000 and the highest globally. El Salvador has limited capacity to absorb the nearly 200,000 individuals who could be subjected to immediate deportation. We welcomed these individuals to America to save them from danger.

As another example, although Haiti has made important strides toward re-

construction, its capacity to effectively manage repatriation efforts has faced substantial setbacks, including the continuing cholera epidemic and devastating hurricane in late 2016. Additionally, conditions in Haiti were further complicated by two category 5 hurricanes—Irma and Maria, which struck in September. These recent developments exacerbate already fragile conditions in Haiti.

As the Department of Homeland Security's own internal memorandum from April 2017 outlined, an estimated 30 percent of the population—approximately 3.2 million people—suffer from food insecurity, and 40 percent of the population lacks access to fundamental health and nutrition services.

In other words, it is not safe for those individuals to go back to Haiti. They have been here. This is their home. They want to make this their home, and we should give them that opportunity.

Let me conclude by again quoting Becky, one of the Dreamers I met at the University of Maryland, College Park. She said that the best present she ever got was on her 13th birthday when President Obama executed the Executive order that gave her legal status and hope here in America.

Well, we can give her an even better present right now. We can give her the present of Congress acting to provide protection for the Dreamers and for those on TPS so they don't have to worry again and they know they have a home here in America.

I urge my colleagues to pass legislation that will protect the Dreamers and TPS.

Mr. President, I certainly hope we will do the minimum that the Congress of the United States can get done, and that is to pass a budget before the deadline of tomorrow evening.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The Senator from Hawaii.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, Republicans control every level of the Federal Government. They hold majorities in the House and the Senate. They have the Presidency. Yet the very people—the Republicans—who set the agenda in Washington and have majorities in both the House and the Senate are desperately trying to convince the American people that a government shutdown should be blamed on anyone else but them. Give me a break.

Nobody wants a shutdown except, maybe, the President, who seems to relish a government shutdown as a way of "shaking things up," regardless of who gets hurt. Members of Congress should know better, and Republicans should get down to business and negotiate with Democrats in good faith.

Republicans in the House and Senate have brought us to the brink of a shutdown because they are terrified of the ideological extremists in their own

party who reject even the most reasonable bipartisan compromises. They are terrified of a mercurial President, who changes his mind on a whim, who explodes at even the most minor slights, and who has repeatedly said that maybe we need a good government shutdown so he can get his vanity wall. Donald Trump and the Republicans will be held responsible for any government shutdown. They have created this situation, and the American people will hold them accountable.

Democrats have been open and transparent about the things we are fighting for. We are fighting to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, so 9 million kids across the country can continue to access the life-saving healthcare they need. We are fighting to restore funding to community health centers that serve millions of underserved Americans in rural communities, whether they live in Kansas, Ohio, or any of the other States Trump won. We are fighting to protect the Dreamers who could be deported to countries they know little of because the President unnecessarily and cruelly ended the DACA Program. We are also fighting for parity in funding for defense and domestic spending in any budget deal.

These are not partisan Democratic priorities. If one were to put each of these priorities up for a vote, they would all pass with bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. In fact, we could have passed each of these bills a long time ago. Yet, instead of doing something that would actually help people, the Republicans spent months working as hard as they could behind closed doors to give the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in our country and corporations huge tax cuts. Now they are trying to convince the other 99 percent of the American public that this tax bill was a good deal for them, but that is another story and is another example of misplaced priorities.

In getting back to the matter at hand, which is the urgency of preventing a government shutdown, the House is trying to pass another short-term spending bill that only includes a reauthorization for children's health and not the other important priorities we need to support. The Republicans in Congress are trying to pit communities, children, families, and Dreamers against one another in an attempt to divide and conquer. They are hoping we will support yet another government funding bill that kicks the can down the road because they will have funded children's health, even as, in their bill, they abandon the Dreamers and the rural communities that depend on community health centers.

We cannot allow this cynical Republican ploy to succeed. We need to keep fighting for children's health, for community health centers, for Dreamers, and for parity. I will not vote for any government funding bill that does not include all four of these important and urgent priorities. We cannot leave anyone behind because it is clear Donald

Trump will not keep his promise to protect those we call the DACA kids.

I was at the White House last week when the President looked us in the eye and said on national TV that he would sign a bipartisan compromise on the Dreamers. He barely waited for us to leave the White House before renegeing on that promise. Then we all know what happened last week during the meeting with Senators DURBIN and GRAHAM at the White House when he was presented with a bipartisan compromise.

We cannot let the President's irresponsible behavior stop us from fighting for Dreamers who deserve our support and protection. Dreamers like Getsi from Beaverton, OR, whom I met late last month when she traveled to Washington, DC, to fight for the passage of the Dream Act. Getsi's parents brought her to Oregon from Mexico when she was only 4 years old. The journey was long and hard, and Getsi's sister was left behind.

While growing up, Getsi's parents warned her not to talk about her immigration status because even mentioning it to the wrong person could result in their deportations. She lived in constant fear. While growing up, Getsi's parents always emphasized the importance of her obtaining a higher education, and while her mom and dad only completed the 5th and 12th grades, respectively, they instilled a love of learning in their daughter and a deep desire to go to college.

After working hard in high school, Getsi enrolled in Western Oregon University, where she is studying to become a gerontological nurse. Getsi works incredibly hard. She is taking 20 credits a semester. I remember, when I was in college, 15 credits was a lot. She is taking 20 credits a semester, is working full time at an assisted living facility, and has recently become a certified rock climbing instructor. Getsi is scheduled to graduate a year early, in May, from Western Oregon University. After graduation, she is planning to enroll in an accelerated nursing master's program so she can realize her dream of becoming a gerontological nurse practitioner.

When I asked what inspired her to pursue such a selfless career, Getsi talked about wanting to care for people like her grandmother back in Mexico and for her parents as they got older. Without the protections DACA provides, Getsi will lose her work authorization, and if she is not able to work, she will not be able to pay for school and will be unable to pursue her dreams.

When I asked her why she traveled for days to come to Washington to share this message with Congress, her response was very moving. She said:

I have so many dreams and aspirations, and I urge people here to understand how much these Dreamers have to give to the U.S. We were brought at such a young age, we don't know anything about our homelands. I want to be able to stay in the U.S.,

to stay with my friends and family—my nieces and nephew—everyone who is looking up to me. I want to prove that my parents' sacrifice meant something.

This is a pivotal moment for Congress. Are we going to do more than pay lip service to Dreamers like Getsi by doing our jobs to protect them and provide healthcare to millions of children and families across the country or are we going to bend to the whims of an unpredictable, mercurial, and unreliable President?

Rather than waiting for the President to make up his mind, I call on the majority leader to recognize that as a separate branch of government, Congress should be a check on the excesses of the executive branch. It is about time the majority leader and Republicans in Congress stepped up to do their jobs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, most people who are watching TV or who are watching C-SPAN know we are at a very important place here. We are in a position wherein, at midnight tomorrow night, if Congress doesn't act, we will shut down the government. What does shutting down the government mean? It means a lot of things.

It means there are going to be a number of employees who will be wondering when they will get their next paychecks or whether they will get repaid, depending upon whether we make a decision to pay them for time worked.

It means people who need desperately needed services may be wondering whether they will be able to get those services, and—if, for no other reason, even if the money is there—is the distraction going to slow down badly needed services to a number of people who rely on the Federal Government as their safety net?

It is going to mean our military will wonder whether America will really be behind them anymore because the games we are playing in the Senate are more important than the work they are doing to protect the Nation and to protect our allies. It is going to mean a lot of very negative things that should be avoided. I am going to talk a little bit about it.

What I first want to do is to summarize what we are trying to do—people like me who are going to support the continuing resolution. Now, to be honest with you, I hate the whole continuing resolution process.

When I was younger, there was a time when our family was struggling. My father was doing construction work, and he literally had to borrow money to pay for the materials he

needed to actually do the job so that he could pay the bills for the family. The way he did that and the way you still do it today, in struggling families, is that you get these 90-day notes. You go to a banker, you tell them you have a project to work on, and you prove to them that you can pay the money back in 90 days and then you pay them back.

Well, that is how we are running the business of the most important Nation that has ever existed. A 1-month CR, a 3-month CR, or a 12-month CR is not the way you run the greatest Nation on the face of the planet. It has a number of problems with it, not the least of which is that you can't give the military any certainty to know what they can invest in for the next new generation weapon or defense system, because they simply don't know if the money will be there for them to make that investment. It means that we are getting far less production for our dollar, we are inefficient, and we are sending a message to the world that we are not serious about the long-term investment that we need to make for our safety and security.

It also affects a number of other agencies, but I think this is very important in these times with all the heightened threats across the world. If we send a message that we are not here for the long term and we are not willing to make those long-term investments, that is a bad message to send. That is the problem with CRs versus what we call regular order—to sit down, negotiate appropriations, pass appropriations bills, and give the men and women in uniform, give the government employees, and give the people who rely on our safety net some certainty. That is our job.

That is why I support a bill that Senator HELLER is proposing. It is called the No Budget, No Pay Act. I think the Senate Members and the Members of the House should not get a paycheck when they fail to do their job. Doing their job means they pass appropriations bills, they pass a budget, and they actually do the job they swore they would do if they won a race for the Senate or the Congress. I hope that bill gets a debate on the floor. I look forward to supporting it when it does.

Let's go back to the CR. The CR is simple. It is 4 weeks long. All it really does is to make sure that we have funding for our servicemembers. It makes sure we have funding for our veterans. It makes sure we have funding for the CHIP program. It actually authorizes it for several years. It gives certainty to States and to people who need support that it is going to be there. It also provides funding for small business loans and funding for the National Institutes of Health. It does a number of other things, but those are critically important.

We have some Members who are trying to negotiate a deal for the DACA population. DACA is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. It is a program that President Obama put into

place in 2012. It is actually something that I have been working on since we filed the bill in August—and long before that—to try to get reasonably minded Members on both sides of the aisle to come up with a solution that makes sense. But now we have people who actually want to shut down the government because we haven't reached a bipartisan agreement that I think is not that far away. The problem that I have with that is that I think it is going to create a toxic environment in Washington, DC, that is not only going to provide all the uncertainty that I talked about on the prior slide, but it is even going to alienate people who are coming to the table trying to negotiate a bipartisan agreement. Now we are at a point where we are trying to figure out if we can fund the government either through a vote sometime tomorrow or if there will be a shutdown tomorrow night.

I have only been here for about 3 years, and I have been in politics for 12 years. I find it interesting how things change overnight, how things that were untenable or awful just a couple of months or a couple of years ago are justified today based on the disagreement we have on the DACA deal, which I am convinced we will get done before the March 5 deadline, and I hope sooner than that because there are a lot of good kids who came to this Nation through no fault of their own, through a decision made by an adult, who deserve a path to citizenship, who deserve the respect of this Nation, and who should be welcome because there are a lot of good kids.

I will keep working on a solution, but now we have people who want to distract us, not only to distract us from trying to negotiate a reasonable outcome for DACA but adding the distraction and creating the toxic environment that shutting down the government will cause.

If we go back, what is amazing to me is that the very people who are now saying we should shut down the government made these kind of statements in the past. This is from former Speaker PELOSI in the House: "Not too long ago it was an unthinkable tactic to use in a political debate."

There is a long list of people.

Senator NELSON: "You don't hold the country hostage."

But that is exactly what they are proposing today.

Senator KING: "... the constant hostage-taking situation to get something in that process that you couldn't get through the normal process."

It is a hard quote to read, but the point is that now they want to take hostages. Now they want to do exactly what they thought, not long ago, was inappropriate, unkind, unfair, and uncompassionate.

Then we have Senator HEITKAMP: "It is really bullying behavior when the small minority does this."

I think it will be a minority that will oppose funding the government. So

now people who didn't like the bullying behavior are trying to rationalize that somehow that it is OK.

The other issue we have here is that we have been getting close on a funding discussion, and we have been getting close on DACA. I don't know. I can't speak to you all directly, but if I were speaking to the pages, I would ask them whether or not they saw the "Peanuts" cartoon. There is a common theme that we talk about with Lucy and the football. The scene is where you are running down the field and you are about to kick the football, and just at about the time that you are going to do it, there is a group of people who want to pull the football away. That is what they are doing again.

Honestly, it gets tiring to see us come so close, to have so many reasonably minded people. Guess what. There are unreasonable people. It is a bipartisan situation we have here. I have friends. They are friends of mine, but on certain issues they become unreasonable. They are not part of the solution. All of a sudden they create these coalitions, and they are the Lucy taking away the football from those of us who actually want to score, want to make progress, want to fund the Government, and want to provide a solution for the DACA population. Now we have another Lucy and the football scenario on both the spending bill and also the DACA bill.

I also have to talk about the CHIP program. The CHIP program is something I wanted to reauthorize in September of last year. September of last year was the month before the program technically expired. However, there was sufficient money in reserves for the States to continue to run the programs. Those States are starting to run out of money, including States like mine, North Carolina. Now we have an opportunity to reauthorize for years, to provide certainty to this child population for years, and we are going to hold it hostage because we have an honest disagreement over things I think we can work out with the DACA Program.

We have seen what people have said in the past. In fact, one of these Senators actually had a countdown on how many days we failed to reauthorize DACA. It may very well be that when we take the vote tonight, that very same Senator will vote against a multiyear reauthorization for the CHIP program. That doesn't make sense. It is irrational. It doesn't solve anything. It creates a bigger problem when it comes to the funding discussion and when it ultimately comes to a reasonable outcome for the DACA population.

Finally, we can talk about the words of the Democratic leader. Again, it is amazing to me how things have changed.

So did you believe what you were saying then? Or is who we see now and what position you are taking now who you really are? People need to come to the floor and let me know. Is this what

you meant or is your new position what you meant? You can't have it both ways. In politics, people try to, but you need to say something and stick with it. They need to defend which is their real position. If those are their positions in the past, let's pass the spending bill, let's work hard to get DACA done, and let's stop this theater that is not helping anybody. All this is doing is making people who work and rely on government funding worry, and it is making people who rely on government funding and the DACA population even more worried. Every day they think they are 1 day closer to having an illegal status here.

We see speeches on the floor about the Dreamers, the people who are doing well. Most of them are going to school, working, or serving in the military. I believe every single one of them. There are tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of more examples. That is why I am so motivated to come up with a solution. That is why I am so frustrated with those playing these games when we are so close.

So let's talk about DACA. There is the so-called gang that is putting together a bill. Let me back up and talk about a meeting that I attended in the White House last Tuesday. In the prior meeting I attended the previous Thursday, Republicans met with the President. We said: Mr. President, the way for us to get to a solution is to call Democrats and Republicans into a room, Members of the House and Senate, have us air our differences and then agree to a timeline for negotiating a deal that we can bring to the American people and solve this problem.

The President responded by calling a meeting on that Tuesday. Some people may have seen it. There was about 50 minutes of press coverage. Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who just came in here, was a part of that meeting. We all felt great about it. We aired our differences. We knew there were differences we needed to bridge. We agreed to four different pillars that we would use as a basis for negotiation. Come up with something that the DACA population needs, something compassionate—something very similar or maybe something between the bill that Senator LANKFORD, Senator HATCH, and I proposed, the SUCCEED Act and the Dream Act—and bridge the differences. We were making progress. We also knew that we had to deal with things like the diversity lottery, border security, and what some of our colleagues call family reunification, which has been abused and needs to be fixed. Others call it chain migration.

At the end of that meeting, we agreed that what we needed to do was to have the leaders, the whips of the House and the Senate—the Democrats and the Republicans—agree to a timeline and a schedule and then get together and work out our differences. I, for one, think those meetings should

be open to the public because then the public would realize, I think, that we are not that far apart. Unfortunately, we are a week and a half later, and the parties have not even reached an agreement on a schedule to begin the negotiations. Now we have another group of people that say: We have something that is pretty close and we may file a bill, or you need to get on to the bill.

Let me tell you the problem I have with that bill or the concept of the bill. No. 1, has it been introduced? No. So it is “thoughtware.” None of us can talk about the specific provisions because we don’t have something we can score, look at, or understand the benefits and risks and issues associated with it and whether or not we can get the votes.

The question is, Does the bill have the support of the President? Well, I think you saw what was vetted on Thursday, which was not a specific provision, and that meeting last week didn’t go too well on several different levels. We don’t have an agreement.

The other question is, if you don’t have an agreement with the President, you have to understand the process of the Congress. If the President were to veto the bill, and we are struggling to get 60 votes, now we would have to get 67 votes. Does anybody here honestly believe we will get 67 votes to withstand a veto override? So we have to get back to this one, to get the President behind it, because that is not going to happen. Even if that could happen, then we have to go to the House. It is not about a simple majority of the House Members. We have to think about a supermajority of House Members that would override a Presidential veto. Right now, based on the number of Members who are in the House—there are a couple of open seats—that is 288 votes. That isn’t going to happen. That is not a very good scorecard. It is not a recipe for success.

I am one of the ones who want checked boxes next to a bill that the President supports, that the Senate will get 60 votes on, and the House will get more than half, so that we can solve the problem for the DACA population.

Things happen quickly here, and, hopefully, this is another example where they will. I hope my Republican colleagues recognize that voting against the funding bill is a bad idea. How do you work out of a shutdown? Almost certainly it will not end well. So I hope my Republican colleagues will vote for the spending bill, and I hope a majority or a good number of my Democratic colleagues will, so that we get the spending issue off the table. Then I hope that same group of people will come together and recognize that the gaps are not that hard to bridge for the DACA solution, that the border security measures are reasonable, that the changes in the elimination of the diversity lottery and a more reasonable way to allow merit-based immigration makes sense. We can deal with under-

represented countries to make absolutely certain that good hard-working people in those countries who want to come and live and work in America can do it. This is not a difficult thing to do.

It is almost as if people are going in the backroom trying to figure out how to make this more difficult than it needs to be.

I am telling and imploring the Members of the Senate, whether you are Republican or Democrat, vote for funding the Government. Vote for our soldiers. Vote for our veterans. Vote for the children who require these programs who are desperately in need of certainty. Then, quickly, get on DACA and vote for the Dreamers who need our support. Vote for border security so we can know who is coming across this border and we can make the Nation safer. These are commonsense, rational, and reasonable expectations, and if we lower the temperature here, if we treat people with respect, and if we actually not let the polar opposites impact what those of us in the center want to do, then we can avoid this crisis and we can do great things for millions of people.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak—because Senator PERDUE wants to speak right after me—I ask unanimous consent that Senator PERDUE, assuming he shows up before I am done, be the next one in line to follow me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DACA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to offer remarks about an issue of utmost important to this body and to the American people—the ongoing negotiations over the future of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA.

I should explain the justification for these young people. The children were brought here by their parents. Their parents crossed the border without papers, violating the law, but the children cannot be held guilty for the sins of their parents. That is why we feel it is very legitimate to do this humanitarian thing of legalizing DACA children—not in and of itself, but, as you heard from my colleague from North Carolina and you will hear from other people, the necessity of making sure that we have border security, that we do away with chain migration, and that we also do away with diversity visas—this is the scope of negotiations that ought to be going on to get a compromise for the humanitarian reason of giving certainty to these young DACA people.

Those things were narrowed at the White House a week ago Tuesday, not the famous Thursday meeting that you heard so much about last weekend but

the meeting of 23 Republican and Democrat Members of both the House and Senate. When you get a bicameral, bipartisan group of people together with the President—and you want to do that because you want to make sure that when you reach an agreement, the President will sign it—it seems to me that is a significant way to move forward. But things tend to take different routes around here, and I am here because of some routes that I think are very puzzling at this point—pretty much along the lines of what the Senator from North Carolina just stated.

Last week, speaking to my colleagues, I told this body that we still weren’t any closer to a legitimate and fair deal that promotes and protects the interests of the American people in a lawful immigration system, and, at the same time, what is very important is providing a fair and equitable solution on DACA. But we also want to take care of the interests of the American people, particularly the safety of the American people when it comes to criminal aliens.

Since I made that speech a week ago, we made some progress in a meeting that went on at the White House, which I just told you about. In spite of the many events of these past 2 weeks, the pronouncement I just made that we don’t have a legitimate, fair deal on one hand to protect the American people and, on the other hand, to deliver the humanitarian ends that we need for the DACA kids—that pronouncement still holds true.

Unfortunately, immigration has become the “Groundhog Day” of the U.S. Senate. Democrats, and even some Republicans, keep repeating the same mistakes that we have been making for the past 30 years, and they don’t seem to be learning from them. I should probably tell my colleagues what I have learned in those 30 years.

Thirty years ago, when I voted for an immigration bill—the last great big reform of immigration—we had 3 million undocumented people here. In good faith, we thought we had secured the border because throughout the history of the country, from the beginning, it had never been illegal to hire an illegal alien, and for the first time, we made it illegal for our employers to hire someone who is undocumented, taking away the magnet to come to this country. We thought it would secure the border if they couldn’t be legally hired, and we legalized 3 million people. We didn’t take into consideration the whole industry of false documents in which, if I go to an employer and show him a false document and they believe it is a true document, then they are not guilty of hiring me, even though I am technically an undocumented worker, because I am using a fraudulent document.

What happens when you reward illegality? You get more of it. So instead of the 3 million people we had legalized, we now have an 11-million person issue. That is what I have been told.

We don't want to repeat those mistakes, and that is why, besides legalizing DACA kids, border security and doing away with chain migration are so important. One of the bombers in New York was here because of chain migration—the terrorist who was just about ready to—well, he didn't kill anyone, but he injured a lot of people. Then we have another person who was here on a diversity visa and killed 8 people and injured 12 while driving down the streets of New York. So we have a major problem we have to take care of.

The President is very interested in taking care of this problem, as he enunciated in that Tuesday meeting, which was bicameral and bipartisan and narrowed the issues so that it would be easier for us to reach an agreement here. Instead of dealing with 100 things, 4 are taken care of—DACA, border security, doing away with diversity visas, and doing away with chain migration.

We don't want "Groundhog Day" to happen again in the U.S. Senate because it has been happening quite frequently. In the last 30 years, we thought we could solve this problem once and for all by taking away the magnet for people to come here for jobs, and we would secure the border. Well, 30 years later, you can understand why the President wants a wall and more border security.

In recent days, several of my colleagues formed what can best be described as a poor man's version of the Gang of 8. The Gang of 8 is affiliated with a very bad bill called comprehensive immigration. It passed in 2013 and went nowhere in the House of Representatives because it was unrealistic. These six Senators have decided that they—and they alone—will come up with a solution to the DACA crisis. Now they are demanding that their solution—and no other solution—receive a vote or they will shut the government down at midnight tomorrow night. That is right. These Senators, along with many Democrats, are threatening to shut the government down unless this plan gets a vote.

Surely, if these Senators are willing to prevent basic services from being provided to law-abiding, tax-paying American citizens and legal immigrants, their plan must be something that could garner wide bipartisan support, pass the House, and be signed into law by the President. It is far short of those four things that were agreed to at the bipartisan, bicameral meeting at the White House.

What is actually in this grand plan these Senators have come up with? Well, as of today, neither I nor my staff have actually seen text of the bill they are promoting. Why are they threatening a shutdown of the Federal Government over a bill that almost no one has been given a chance to read, and why are they threatening to shut down the government when there is still plenty of time? The deadline is March

5 to come to a meaningful solution that can earn bipartisan support.

Well, here is what we do know about their proposal, from one-page summaries. The bill would provide a massive amnesty to millions of people who are in this country unlawfully—before border security, making the same mistake we did in 1986. Their proposal doesn't just provide status to the young men and women enrolled in the DACA Program, which everyone in this Chamber agrees should be done; it dramatically expands the scope, granting legal status to potentially millions of others, including those who knowingly violate the law. It is unthinkable to me that we should reward that unlawful conduct, and it is ridiculous that Democrats and some Republicans are turning the tables and making this last-minute demand when there was such a successful meeting at the White House a week ago Tuesday. It was bipartisan, bicameral, with the President leading the discussion and everyone agreeing that we would narrow the 100 issues down to 4: DACA, border security, diversity visas, and ending chain migration.

Surely then, in exchange for this massive amnesty, their proposal would provide significant border security, enforcement, and chain migration reforms. If you were hoping for that answer to be yes, don't hold your breath. Their proposal has a paltry amount of funding for existing border security infrastructure improvement. That is right—no new infrastructure.

Their proposal also doesn't add new legal authorities to make it easier for law enforcement to apprehend, detain, and deport dangerous criminal aliens. Now, I think they are somewhat embarrassed that they don't have some proposals in there that dangerous criminal aliens ought to be deported easier than they are today.

So I have to ask, is there a reason why these Senators don't want to make it easier to remove these dangerous criminals? Do they want to protect sex offenders? Do they want to protect child molesters? Do they want drunk drivers, gang members, like MS-13, human traffickers, and drug smugglers roaming throughout this great United States of America?

I can't imagine the answer to any of these questions is yes. If I am right, then they need to tell the American people why they refused to give our government the new authorities needed to remove these individuals who have endangered our communities. They either support removing dangerous criminals or they don't. There is no going in between.

Their plan also fails to truly end chain migration. In fact, in that one-page document I have seen, these Senators acknowledge their chain migration fix would only affect 26,266 visas per year. That is right, just a little above 26,000. So in exchange for a potential amnesty for 8 million people, they have agreed to eliminate 26,000

visas a year. I am no mathematician, but that doesn't seem to be a very balanced agreement to me. They seem to be making the same mistakes I made in 1986.

Finally, their proposal doesn't even end the Diversity Visa Program. Remember, this is one of four agreements in a bicameral, bipartisan meeting with the President of the United States that everybody left the White House with an agreement that we were going to break within those four.

This Diversity Visa Program, we all know, is subject to fraud and abuse, and colleagues on both sides of the aisle have long called for its elimination—and I mean elimination, not reallocation. The proposal they are floating around doesn't do that.

To sum it up, this proposal is heavy on amnesty, learning nothing from the 1986 mistake I learned a lot from. Too bad there is only a handful of us around the U.S. Senate from that time because there would be a lot more missionaries saying that what happened in 1986 shouldn't be repeated.

Also, more importantly, it is non-existent on security measures. This approach has been tried time and again, and that approach has failed. The American people simply don't want to provide a massive amnesty first and secure the border later. For those Members who think we can do amnesty first and security second, I think I made it quite clear: I think that is the wrong approach. I know because I have been here a long time, and I have been here at the time those mistakes have been made. We know they failed the goals we sought. I remember why it failed. Maybe—just maybe—if we actually provide safety first and then consider more comprehensive reforms later, we can break this repetitive cycle and end this immigration "Groundhog Day."

Maybe I ought to add to those four points that were agreed to at the White House. The President was promoting another step or two called comprehensive immigration reform, but get this done first. Secure the border first. If we actually provide security first, doing so would instill trust with the American people that we are dedicated to fixing this immigration issue, not simply delaying the same debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, as an outsider to this process, one of the first realizations was that, as I got here, things don't always move in a linear fashion from point A to point B. Many times, the people who are trying to move an issue from point A to point B aren't interested in getting to point B.

I would like to talk tonight about one of those issues. I think we have a situation here where both sides in this body—and I dare say in the House—pretty much want the same thing, but

I am afraid politics have gotten involved to where we are focusing more on the differences of what we might hope for than on what we agree upon. That is a shame because not only do we put a great confusion on these issues that I will talk about tonight, but we lose the confidence of the American people that we can even govern up here.

Last year, this President wanted to focus on getting the economy going. He wanted to focus on energy. He wanted to focus on regulations. He wanted to focus on taxes. Check the boxes. We did that. I believe we are seeing some of the early manifestations of that in the economy now, where 123 businesses just announced at the end of the year, year-end bonuses related to this tax bill that we passed last year. That is an example of where we can get together and make things happen.

I was in the Chair last night presiding over an hour and listening to conversations about a topic that I believe is very critical to where we are today. I heard several descriptions of a DACA bill but a bill no one has seen yet. It hasn't been presented. This is merely 1 day before we have to fund the government—before midnight tomorrow night.

In my opinion, I think most people in America believe it is irresponsible that Members of this body are threatening to shut down the Federal Government over this DACA issue.

Members of the other side of the aisle used to agree with that position. In 2013, the current minority leader said—and other people talked about this today: “We could say, ‘we’re shutting down the government . . . until you pass immigration reform.’ It would be governmental chaos.”

Well, that is what we are facing tonight. I just don't think there is any need for it because, honestly, if you want to solve the DACA situation, there is a deal to be done, but serious negotiations aren't being made right now because one side wants to create this issue and threaten to shut down the government, thinking they can get both, a financing deal that they favor, along with this DACA proposition. That is unfortunate.

Our men and women in uniform deserve better than that. You are an ex-officer. You know what I am saying. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are in the fourth month of this fiscal year in the middle of January—our fiscal year started October 1. It is absolutely ridiculous that we are sitting here today having not funded the government permanently for the balance of this year. No other entity that I know of anywhere—any business or any facet of operation—can do that except the U.S. Federal Government.

These two issues we are talking about have nothing to do with it and should not be tied together; that is, the DACA solution and funding the Federal Government. Given our global security crisis—and I do mean the word “crisis”

today—I think the world is more dangerous than any time in my lifetime. I can't think of anything worse than to tie up the funding for our men and women in uniform with an issue like this; that we all want to solve anyway.

I am shocked the Democrats would advocate that we shut down the government over a bill no one has even seen yet and an issue that has nothing to do with getting the government funded. Creating a false deadline for a DACA solution, I believe—and using it to hold military certainty hostage—is no way to govern. I think most people back home agree with that. That is what is wrong with this institution today. Both sides need to stop it right now. We need to get to a vote and fund this government.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I would like to make a few comments about the current immigration system. That seems to be the topic of the day recently. I want to tell you some of us have been working on this for years. Some in this body have been working on it at least the last decade. Three times in the last 11 years, this body has tried to solve this problem unsuccessfully.

I believe one of the problems with each of those solutions or attempts at a solution was they tried to be comprehensive. People are misusing that word today when they talk about what we are trying to do on this side. These three attempts, over the last 11 years, attempted to solve not just the illegal situation and the temporary work visa situation, but they also tried to solve the legal situation. They tried to solve all of this.

Today, what we are trying to do on our side is to solve just the illegal immigration system before we even talk about DACA. The legal situation is this: 1.1 million green cards are given out every year today. That is up from 300,000 in 1965, when this bill—the law we operate under today—was first passed. What we believe is, if we get this done, then the next step would be to move to the temporary work visas, where we give out 2.2 million temporary work visas every year. Those need desperate work. Both sides agree to that. Some categories probably need to be increased; others need to be streamlined. There might need to be a new category created, but that needs speciality work.

Then, of course, we have to deal with the people who are here illegally. Remember, 40 percent of the people here illegally, or thereabouts, came into this country under a legal temporary work visa or a student visa, or some other form of temporary visa and overstayed their visa. We are one of the few countries in the developed world that can't track overstays, but that is not what we are trying to do. We are trying to bring focus to an issue that will stop this continuing evolution of immigration problems.

I believe there is a better way, and there is a proposition to do just that. There was a meeting in the White House last week on Tuesday, and the President started out the conversation—it was bipartisan, bicameral. You heard my colleague from Iowa Senator GRASSLEY talk about this. As part of that meeting, I was moved by how the President introduced this topic. He said, with regard to the DACA situation, we need to develop a compassionate approach that demonstrates love in dealing with these young people who are here illegally but through no fault of their own. The President, in that meeting, defined the scope, and he brought a sense of urgency to this topic. He expects a result.

He undid what we believe was an illegal act by the past President in giving work status to these individuals, and said—now this is President Trump—he said: This is the responsibility of Congress to put a law in place to deal with this. I agree with that, but let's be very clear about what is going on right now. We are not debating what to do with the DACA individuals, mostly aged 15 to 36.

My colleagues spoke last night as though they are the only ones committed to solving the DACA problem. That is not true. People on both sides of the aisle—in this body and in the House—believe we need to solve this problem. These individuals did not break the law, their parents did. We all agree there is a solution to be had. Again, the question is whether we are going to solve DACA without dealing with the things that created it in the first place.

The President was very clear last week—and he has been consistent on this issue, as have those of us who have been working on this over the last year, this new, focused approach on legal immigration. The President made it very clear that any solution on DACA has to include border security—including a wall—an end to chain migration, and an end to this perverse diversity visa lottery.

If we don't actually solve what created this, we are going to be right back here in just a few years. That is the problem I have with the bill that is being discussed here, this so-called Graham-Durbin exercise. I just don't know why we would do that and knowingly put ourselves in the same position in just a few years.

Haven't we learned our lesson from what we did in 1986, 1991? We know kicking the can down the road on this is not going to give us any solution, but we have an opportunity because we have commonality in this body about what we need to do going forward with not only the DACA situation but this legal immigration system. There is a great deal of commonality in thought. I have done deals in the business world, and when you get this level of commonality, a deal should get done. There is a lot of symmetry here to be had if we would just talk with each other and

get at the real issues and put political issues aside.

If we give DACA recipients a path for legal status without a real investment in border security and a wall, we are going to further incentivize a new wave of illegal immigration.

By the way, the President has said this publicly. It is not necessarily a 2,000-mile wall, but it is a system of constraints where we know that we can protect our southern borders. It is not just an immigration issue; it is a national security issue, as has been demonstrated by two acts of terror just in recent months. The plans I heard last night don't even address that seriously. A \$1.8 billion allocation is not a serious attempt at that. The Dream Act—the estimated cost back in 2013 for doing that was \$26 billion. Today, who knows what that estimate would be. It has to be greater than that.

The second criteria in this was that if we are going to solve the DACA problem and eliminate the things that created this issue going forward, we have to deal with how to protect the family of the immigrant, the primary worker. We must protect the immediate family of the person who is sponsored and comes in as a citizen. But I believe there is a great deal of confusion about that. This is the so-called chain migration. There is nothing derogatory about that term. That was a term used by the Gang of 8 in 2013. The Democratic leader and the whip of the Democrats right now all used that term repeatedly. There was nothing derogatory and there is certainly nothing prejudicial about that term; it was a mere description of what happens in the current law.

The current law says this: The person sponsored for citizenship comes in as a legal permanent resident, moves through a period of time, and becomes a citizen. If they apply, they become a citizen. After that process, as a citizen, they can then sponsor their spouse, their immediate minor children, their family, their adult married children, their adult unmarried children, their parents, and their siblings. The only thing we are talking about is limiting that to the primary worker and their immediate family, and that would break the so-called chain as described by our Members across the aisle.

Let's be very clear. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe that immigration should be limited to the individual worker, their spouse, and their immediate family. Again, the only difference between that ethos and what we have today are the parents and the siblings.

Somebody says: Well, I want to protect the family.

Well, so do we. But whose family? The family of the sponsored worker or their parents' family or their parents' parents' family or their parents' parents' siblings' family? Which family? I believe the American people have spoken loud and clear about which family.

There is a significant portion who believe it should just be the worker, but

that is not our position. We believe we need to protect the family of that immediate worker.

There are some of us who are trying to get to a merit-based immigration system like Canada and Australia have been using for decades and they have proven works. It helps their society, builds their economy, and opens their doors with a welcoming hand for those who want to come. Canada is no bastion of conservatism in its immigration policy. Yet it has a merit-based immigration system.

Now, we are not proposing that. We are happy to wait for phase two, which the President talked about last week. Many people on the other side have absolutely discredited his words and confused them knowingly. What the President is talking about right now is, focus on this legal immigration system, solve DACA, solve the border crisis, eliminate the chain migration issue, and eliminate the diversity visa lottery. It is just that simple.

The diversity visa lottery is the last thing in his scope, and it is so easy. We all know that needs to be eliminated. The issue comes up in their bill that they want to reallocate the 50,000 people who are coming in today. We know that the diversity visa lottery is fraught with fraud. We know that it has been related to at least one act of terrorism, and it needs to be eliminated. How to do it is the question. Well, let's talk about that.

There is no reason why that can't be negotiated. But the Graham-Durbin bill, if it is ever offered, ensures that we will be right back here in a few short years. What we want is to have a solution on the DACA side and protect America from repeating this mistake again and again.

Let me be very clear. If we do what is on the table today in the Graham-Durbin bill, it would allow the parents of DACA recipients legal status. This would ignite future waves of parents entering the United States, putting their children at risk as they come across the border illegally. Thank God most of us have never had to deal with that. Imagine putting your children at risk coming across the border illegally. But then their children will eventually be given legal status, according to this bill and precedent, and then they will be able to sponsor their parents, who broke the law in the first place. Then here we go, reigniting another wave. So we have not done anything to prevent being right back here just a few short years from now.

I believe it is time for action. My colleagues last night talked about, well, nobody is offering up any other solution. Well, that is just not true. There are three Republican Senate bills right now that relate to this issue, active bills that have been filed, and they are out there. The language is out there. You can read them. There is one bill in the House. Chairman GOODLATTE was there in committee and brought out a bill. So it is just not true that we don't

have things to talk about on the Republican side on this issue. What is missing in this process is a good-faith effort to negotiate the details of a deal and make it happen.

To try to make an end run on that process is not going to work. I don't believe it, and I don't think the American people want it. What they want is to solve DACA and ensure that we are not doing it again in just a few short years. This means that we need a real investment in border security. We need to put a focus on the immediate family of the sponsored new U.S. citizen, the family of the incoming immigrant, and we need to end this archaic, outdated diversity visa lottery.

The solutions are here. I might not be 100 percent happy, they might not be 100 percent happy, but I promise you that in my experience, this situation is closer to a deal, a negotiated deal right now because both sides really want to see an end to the situation where there is a question about the DACA recipients. But we want to make sure we are not back here in 5 years or even sooner dealing with the same problem again. That is the lesson we should have learned from 1986 and 1991.

It is an honor to be in this body, but it is time for action. It is time to get to point B. We know we have been trying for over a decade with many Members of this body who are well-intended. I, for one, am ready to negotiate. The President is ready to negotiate. Let's get together and make this happen. It is time for action. The American people demand it. But let's please don't tie this solution to the funding of the Federal Government. That is totally irresponsible. Our men and women in uniform deserve better.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats here in the Senate have really raised obstruction to an art form in this Congress. The Presidential nominees—they have obstructed and obstructed some more, even when they ultimately planned to support the nominee. We have had many nominees who have come to the floor who have been objected to and had to go through the long postcloture process, only to get to the end of it and have those nominees be voted out in many cases unanimously. I have seen that happen in the committee that I chair, the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. We have nominees over here who are noncontroversial who are being held up by the Democrats. Many of them are in important

positions in our government. The FRA—Federal Railroad Administrator—is a key safety position in the administration who is being held up by the Democrats even though he is supremely qualified for the job and I think will have a huge bipartisan vote here in the Senate, were it to occur.

We have seen this consistent pattern of obstruction when it comes to nominees and giving the President an opportunity to fill his administration with the positions that are key to not only his getting his agenda done but the American people seeing their government function in a way that represents their interests.

Tax reform. Well, Democrats absolutely refused to work with Republicans on a bill. They fought hard against passage despite the fact that the Democrats have previously called for reform and supported many of the very proposals that were included in the law.

Now, of course, the Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program—a program they claim to support—because they are not happy that they are not getting an immigration bill that they want this week. That is right, Mr. President—Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for health insurance for 9 million low-income children because they are not getting the bill they want when they want it.

Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to find a legislative solution to the status of children who were brought to this country illegally through no fault of their own. There is broad support among both Democrats and Republicans for getting a solution to that. In fact, there is a group who has been meeting every day on that very issue in an attempt to try to put together a solution that would help address that issue in a way that not only resolves the status of these young people who came to this country illegally but also addresses the broader issue of border security and chain migration and visa lotteries and all those sorts of things. So there are a series of issues that relate to immigration that are being worked on now by both sides of the aisle in the hope that they can come to a solution about that, but there is no agreement just yet.

While we hope to get to a deal as soon as possible, the deadline for reaching an agreement is not imminent, not to mention that passing a bill on the status of Dreamers is completely unrelated to the need to fund the government.

If the Democrats continue with their plan to block government funding, the government will shut down tomorrow night. That means that all kinds of government services will be affected in areas ranging from veterans, to public health, to worker and product safety, and to national parks and monuments. Funding for our military will also be

threatened, which represents a particular danger as we try to rebuild our military after years of neglect under the Obama administration. Also, of course, as I mentioned, the Children's Health Insurance Program will not get funded, and 9 million low-income children will be well on the way to losing their healthcare coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program extension that we want to pass as part of this bill is something that has long been supported by Democrats. In fact, the policy in this bill is virtually identical to the bipartisan extension legislation that was introduced by Senators Hatch and Wyden and passed by the Senate Finance Committee last year, except that we have included an additional year of funding. I serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and when we passed that bill last year, it was a 5-year authorization. The legislation that we will have in front of us this evening that will fund the government includes a 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program. That would mark the longest extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program since the program was created back in 1997. It would provide 6 years of guaranteed funding so that care for children and pregnant women can continue without disruption.

It is extremely difficult to understand how the same Democrats who have strongly advocated for this program are now opposing legislation to extend it and seeking to shut down the government. In fact, Democrats are now actively bragging that they have the votes to shut down the government.

Nobody thinks the short-term funding bill before us is ideal. We would much rather have a long-term agreement, and eventually we will. But this bill will fund the government, it will protect the military, and it will provide a very significant extension of an essential healthcare program for low-income children.

Democrats' intention of opposing this bill because they are upset that they can't get exactly what they want, when they want it, is irresponsible given the good-faith efforts that are being made by both sides to come to an agreement when it comes to the issue of immigration and when it comes to the issue of the broader funding debate we are having here in the Senate. This attempt by the Democrats is totally shortsighted. It is a partisan, political maneuver that will harm our troops and some of the most vulnerable among us.

We still have time before the government shuts down, and I hope the more moderate elements of the Democratic Party here in the Senate will rethink their leader's opposition to funding the government and to extending health insurance for low-income children and for pregnant women. That is what we are talking about. That is simply what this does. There is still time to come

together to pass this bill and to move on to the other important priorities that are facing our Nation.

I hope that cooler heads will prevail, that people here in this Chamber will come to their senses, and that we can pass a funding bill this evening that would avoid a government shutdown tomorrow and would fund for 6 years the Children's Health Insurance Program and set up the conditions that would allow the discussions to continue about how to resolve some of the outstanding and unrelated issues that still need to come to a resolution.

That is my hope. I hope our colleagues on both sides will come to the realization that this idea that is being put forward by the Democrats—and for which, as I said, they are taking credit right now—of shutting down the government is really a bad idea and not in the best interests of the American people, nor those 9 million children who would benefit from a long-term extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, to paraphrase a Republican President I enjoyed knowing, here we go again.

In 1995 Republicans shut down our government. They wanted to recklessly cut education programs and environmental programs, and they even wanted to raise Medicare premiums on millions of senior citizens, and they were willing to shut down the government to do it.

Of course, more recently in 2013, Republicans once again sought to strip the healthcare of millions of Americans. They wanted to shut down the government in a failed effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Actually, that is an effort they continued this summer instead of negotiating a bipartisan budget deal that could have averted the situation we find ourselves in today.

In 2015 Republicans continued their attack on healthcare by bringing us to the brink of yet another government shutdown in an attempt to defund Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the source of healthcare to millions of Americans in rural America. Millions of American women, men, and young people—certainly, tens of thousands of Vermonters in my little State—trust and depend on Planned Parenthood for their basic healthcare needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screening, and HIV screenings—terrible that they might provide that care to Americans.

They tried to shut down the government because of it. It was also in 2015 that the Republicans began their attack on Dreamers. They attempted to shut down the entire Department of Homeland Security, which protects our skies, our borders, and everything else, and they were risking our national security because they wanted to block DACA, the Dreamers bill.

If these were just talking points and political ploys, it would be one thing, but they have real consequences.

The 2013 Republican shutdown dealt a devastating blow to economic growth amounting to \$1.5 billion per day. For a State the size of Vermont, \$1.5 billion is a lot of money. It was an estimated \$1.5 billion for each of the days of the shutdown, and there were 16 of those days. That is economic growth we lost that we never get back. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed through no fault of their own for a combined total of 6.6 million days. Lifesaving research on cancer, on diabetes, on heart conditions ground to a halt. The doors and fences of our iconic national parks and monuments that Americans have always relied on to go and see were shuttered.

Now, in 2018, President Trump wants to shut down the government over a cynical and misbegotten “big, beautiful wall.” And he wants that “big, beautiful wall”—whatever it might be—to be paid for by U.S. taxpayers, not Mexico. He is using the Dreamers as negotiable commodities, as though they are some kind of money, instead of people, to meet his unreasonable demands to spend \$18 billion on last century’s technology. President Trump is making these demands after he promised taxpayers it wouldn’t cost us a cent because Mexico would pay for it. Well, if he really believes that, open a bank account, and let Mexico send the money. When they send the money, we will build the wall. I mean, be serious. He said they will build it. Now he wants the American taxpayers—who are strapped on so many things—to build last century’s technology. Let Mexico send us the money. When they do, we will build it. If he is telling the truth, they will send it. If he is not telling the truth, of course, they will not.

But he is also just continuing the Republican tradition of being the “shutdown party.” We have some very responsible Republicans and Democrats in the House and the Senate. I have not heard a single one of them say we need a good government shutdown. I take it back. One Republican has: Donald Trump. Donald Trump has said that our country needs “a good shutdown.” That is the only person, Republican or Democrat, I have heard say that they want a shutdown.

I wonder if that is what he has asked his own party to angle for—a manufactured crisis to distract from the fact that they are not doing their job. I can say, as the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I know the

Democrats have been ready and willing to negotiate a spending agreement since last June. Instead of working toward that goal, congressional Republican leadership has spent the last year overturning consumer protections. They stripped healthcare from millions of Americans. They passed a massive tax cut for big corporations and wealthy Americans, paid for by middle-class Americans and future generations because it adds trillions to the deficit. But during that time, they continued to kick the can down the road.

They have failed to do their jobs to pass sensible spending bills to keep our government open. They have cast aside Congress’s fundamental responsibilities in pursuit of a hyperpartisan agenda. As a result, we haven’t reached a bipartisan budget deal that would allow us to strengthen our military—something both Republicans and Democrats want. We haven’t reached a bipartisan budget deal to allow us to invest in our communities—something I believe both Republicans and Democrats want.

We all agree that the consequences of sequestration have been devastating. We have to lift the spending caps set into law by the Budget Control Act. Every Republican and Democrat I talked with has said they do, but we have to invest equally in our military and our communities because our national security is intrinsically linked to the investments we make in our communities. We are the greatest country in the world exactly because we make a commitment to invest in education and infrastructure. If we back off of that commitment, we are no longer great. We aim to provide the necessary resources to combat the opioid epidemic, and we strive to ensure that no child goes to school hungry, but if we don’t have defense and nondefense parity in spending, we can’t achieve these goals.

We have not passed a comprehensive disaster relief package that takes into consideration the unique needs of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are American citizens. They have been living without power and without access to clean drinking water, and communities, devastated by natural disasters for months, are without adequate help from their own country—the U.S. Government—and people are dying.

The Dreamers, who are American citizens in every way but on paper, have been thrown into crisis, a crisis of President Trump’s own making, a crisis that threatens to tear them from the only lives they have ever known. Remember, the President is solely responsible—not Members here on this floor—for creating this untenable situation faced by the Dreamers. The President, all by himself—actually he is a party of one—rescinded the DACA policy.

Now we have a path forward, put together by Republicans and Democrats, which meets the requirements the

President laid out himself. But instead he continues to favor governing by chaos. He continues to move the goal posts. He continues to push the agreement further out of reach. He continues to say that our country needs a good shutdown. So much for the “Art of the Deal.” I would never hire someone to make a deal like that.

The latest effort to kick the can down the road, which Republicans passed out of the House this evening, does not address any of these issues. Its attempt to address the needs of the Children’s Health Insurance Program is public relations, but it is inadequate, and based on the President’s own twitter feed—which I get dizzy trying to follow—goes in and out of favor with the President hourly. Why does the bill extend CHIP for 6 years when extending this bipartisan program for 10 years would actually save the taxpayers \$6 billion? Why are community health centers—which millions of Americans and CHIP recipients depend upon for their primary care—not extended? Why don’t we protect Americans and our taxpayers? Most importantly, why was this program allowed to expire and to be used as a negotiating part in the first place?

Republican leadership, led by the President, has brought us to the brink of a government shutdown. I have been here a long time. I have looked at a lot of good legislation and bad legislation. I do not want to say the most terrible thing possible about the House bill because I know the respect we show back and forth. But the House bill is a joke and does not have my support. It leaves too much in doubt. What it attempts to address is woefully inadequate.

The majority now wants bipartisan support. Why not do as we always used to and work with Democrats, instead of appealing for our support only after they have written a mishmash, laughable bill crafted behind closed doors?

I have been here over 40 years. I understand reality. Republicans control the House; Republicans control the Senate; Republicans control the Presidency. If Republicans want the government to stay open, it will stay open. If Republicans want the government to shut down, it will shut it down. I wish they would stop kicking the can down the road and start negotiating in good faith, as so many Senators in both parties have been willing to.

It is time to stop kicking the can down the road and time to start negotiating in good faith. Keep our government open, and show respect to those who live here in this country who consider themselves Americans.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BOB BUTLER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Mayor Bob Butler of Marion, IL. Since April 16, 1963, the people of Marion have known Bob Butler as mayor. Think about this. During Bob Butler's span as mayor, there have been 11 U.S. Presidents and 10 Illinois Governors. Mayor Butler is the second longest serving active mayor in the country and is believed to be the longest serving mayor of Illinois. That is quite an accomplishment.

Prior to becoming mayor, Bob Butler served in the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps after the wars in Japan and Korea. Service was in his blood, so it came as no surprise when Bob decided to run for mayor. Known for his straight-shooting, old-school style, Bob outlined his simple approach to governance during his first campaign: "It's up to the mayor to study each problem as it arises, determine in his own mind what is best to do for all the people. I think the mayor of any town has got to stand on his own two feet and make up his mind without being dictated to by any individual or group. I think also when a man is elected mayor, the people are entitled to know where he stands. He ought to be able to tell the people. If a matter requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer, he should say 'yes' or 'no.'"

Southern Illinois' newspaper of record, the Southern Illinoisan, endorsed Butler's candidacy, saying: "Marion voters will choose Tuesday between orderly, progressive city government or a continuation of the present slap-dash regime . . . Butler, in short, offers an excellent alternative . . . He has our wholehearted support." Bob Butler won by 687 votes and never looked back. He won the next 13 mayoral elections in Marion.

During Mayor Butler's first council meeting, an entire block on the city square caught fire. The new council took office and shortly thereafter adjourned to help fight the fire. The fire shined a light on many of Marion's problems, inadequate firefighting resources and water supply, but that was just the tip of the iceberg. Mayor Butler inherited a city in financial crisis. Marion needed more people. Why? Because more people meant more money from the State. Mayor Butler got to work and, due to his leadership, turned Marion around.

Mayor Butler transformed Marion and southern Illinois through good old-fashioned hard work. Over the years, Mayor Butler's agenda helped turn Marion into a regional powerhouse along Interstate 57. During his tenure, Marion's population has grown nearly 92 percent. According to Mayor Butler, the secret to Marion's success was simply "A strong business community and a strong city working together [that] produced great results." He is absolutely right.

Anyone who knows Mayor Butler knows that he is an avid reader. He is on record saying that his favorite political book is a three-part novel by

Rafael Sabatini, "Scaramouche." It opens with this line: "He was born with a gift of laughter and a sense that the world was mad."

With his 91st birthday approaching next week, I want to thank Mayor Butler for his extraordinary commitment to the people of Marion and his work to help his community and the world be just a little less mad. I wish him and his family all the best in their next chapter.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for January 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office CBO prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

The enforceable levels included in this report reflect all of the numerical adjustments made to the resolution since its passage. These adjustments include an update to enforceable levels for legislation enacted after the June 2017 CBO baseline was released but before enactment of the resolution, October 30, 2017; a revision to aggregates and allocations to accommodate legislation fulfilling the budget resolution's reconciliation instructions, December 19, 2017; and a revision to aggregates and the Appropriations Committee's allocation for emergency spending found in Fiscal Year 2018's third continuing resolution, H.R. 1370, December 21, 2017.

The information contained in this report captures legislative activity from the passage of the budget resolution through January 11, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared tables 1 through 4 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 13 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. First, the Veterans' Affairs and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committees violated their allocations in December 2017, the former with a \$2.1 billion extension of the Veterans Choice Program and the latter through a package of health extenders. Both of these extensions were included as separate divisions on the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, P.L. 115-96. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee violated its allocation earlier this month with the pas-

sage of the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, P.L. 115-103, which is estimated to increase spending by \$5 million over the next 10 years. The Armed Services Committee, on the other hand, reduced spending over the budget window. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, P.L. 115-91, produced \$16 million in outlay savings over the enforceable window.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no full-year appropriations bills have been enacted for Fiscal Year 2018, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year.

The budget resolution contains two points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 3 and 4 show compliance with Fiscal Year 2018 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP, respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under section 4102 and section 4103 of H. Con. Res. 71, respectively. Notably, there have not been any full-year bills enacted thus far for Fiscal Year 2018 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for Fiscal Year 2018, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. In its report, CBO annualizes the temporary effects of the latest continuing resolution, which provides funding through January 19, 2018. For the enforcement of budgetary aggregates, the Budget Committee excludes this temporary funding. As such, the committee views current-law levels as being \$836.3 billion and \$468.6 billion below budget resolution levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively.

Current-law revenues continue to be in excess of the levels assumed by the budget resolution. On-budget revenue levels currently exceed assumed levels by \$17.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2018, \$84.3 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018-2022 period, and \$135.4 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018-2027 period. These figures reflect current enforceable levels following the use of the reserve fund found in section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71 for H.R. 1, which is commonly referred to as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, P.L. 115-97.

Social Security outlay levels are consistent with the budget resolution's figures for all enforceable periods. Social Security revenues, however, are

\$500 million below levels assumed for Fiscal Year 2018, \$2.8 billion greater over the next 5 years and \$26.9 billion greater than assumed over the next 10 years. These off-budget effects were generated by the reconciliation bill but not covered by the reserve fund adjustment filed, which pertained only to on-budget enforcement.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO rule. The Senate's PAYGO scorecard currently shows deficit reduction of \$24 million in Fiscal Year 2018, \$14 million over the Fiscal Year 2017–2022, and \$15 million over Fiscal Year 2017–2027 periods. For Fiscal Year 2018, legislation has been enacted that would reduce outlays by \$24 million. Over the Fiscal Year 2017–2022 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by \$13 million and increase revenues by \$1 million. Over the Fiscal Year 2017–2027 period, legislation has been enacted that CBO estimates will decrease outlays by \$11 million and increase revenues by \$4 million. Notably absent from these amounts are the veterans and health extenders from the third continuing resolution discussed earlier. This is due to a provision in that measure that mandated the exclusion of those budgetary effects from both the Senate and statutory PAYGO scorecards. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71, the Fiscal Year 2018 budget resolution.

Finally, included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the adoption of the budget resolution. During this reporting period, there were seven budgetary points of order raised in the Senate. Six of these points of order were raised during consideration of fiscal year 2018 reconciliation legislation. Votes to waive the CBA with respect to each of the points of order, ranging from Byrd Rule violations to committee allocation breaches, failed. Senator RAND PAUL raised the final budgetary point of order, for a violation of the Budget Committee's jurisdiction, against H.R. 1370, the third continuing resolution. The Senate waived the CBA with respect to this point of order by a vote of 91–8.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

	(In millions of dollars)		
	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS—Continued

	(In millions of dollars)		
	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	–33	–102	–76
Outlays	–24	–15	–16
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	0	2	5
Outlays	0	2	5
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	705	–46	–46
Outlays	205	318	–39
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	2,100	2,100	2,100
Outlays	1,050	2,100	2,100
Indian Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total:			
Budget Authority	2,772	1,954	1,983
Outlays	1,231	2,405	2,050

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS¹

	2018	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	549,057	515,749
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	46	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,698
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	63,878
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	46	92,994
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–549,011	–422,755

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
2018	
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2017	17,000

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
2018	
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–17,000

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
2018	
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	11,224
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–11,224

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2018.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through January 11, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

This is CBO's first current level report for fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

	(In billions of dollars)		
	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	3,085.1	3,333.9	248.7
Outlays	3,101.4	3,260.3	158.9
Revenues	2,497.1	2,514.3	17.2
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ^a	849.6	849.6	0.0

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
Social Security Revenues	873.3	872.8	–0.5

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,106,043	2,004,065	n.a.
Appropriation legislation		513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–866,685	–866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,239,358	1,650,687	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation:			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	–33	–24	0
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign Authorization Act of 2017 (P. L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P. L. 115–97)	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
Total, Enacted Legislation	–1,142	–6,566	–143,800
Continuing Resolution:			
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division A) ^b	1,085,037	627,519	0
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	1,010,879	988,931	0
Total Current Level: ^{a, c}	3,333,869	3,260,308	2,514,339
Total Senate Resolution: ^d	3,085,147	3,101,424	2,497,139
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	248,722	158,884	17,200
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2018–2027			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	31,131,371
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	30,995,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	135,404
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Emergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0

^b Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255), provided funding for innovation projects and state responses to opioid abuse. CBO estimated that for fiscal year 2018, these sections provided a combined \$866 million in budget authority, which would result in \$706 million in outlays. However, consistent with sections 1001–1004 of P.L. 114–255, for the purposes of estimating the budgetary effects of those provisions under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Budget Control Act) and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act), those amounts are estimated to provide no budget authority or outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

^d Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in H. Con. Res. 71, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Senate Resolution as Passed	3,136,721	3,131,688	2,490,936
Adjustments made pursuant to section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71	36,780	21,753	3
Assumed discretionary spending not constrained by the budgetary cap established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25)	–84,440	–44,220	0
Assumed withholding of budgetary effects of reconciliation legislation held in reserve pursuant to section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	0	0	150,000
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	4,686	803	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,085,147	3,101,424	2,497,139

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JANUARY 11, 2018

(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2017–2022	2017–2027
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c,d}			
Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2017 (H.R. 304, P.L. 115–83)	*	*	*
TSP Modernization Act of 2017 (H.R. 3031, P.L. 115–84)	*	*	*
FITARA Enhancement Act of 2017 (H.R. 3243, P.L. 115–88)	*	*	*
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (H.R. 2810, P.L. 115–91)	–24	–16	–21
Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017, Improvements Act (S. 371, P.L. 115–94)	*	*	*
An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes. (H.R. 1370, P.L. 115–96) ^e	*	*	1
An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (H.R. 1, P.L. 115–97) ^f	*	n.a.	n.a.
To amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation (H.R. 560, P.L. 115–101)	*	*	*
400 Years of African-American History Commission Act (H.R. 1242, P.L. 115–102)	*	*	*
Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act (H.R. 1306, P.L. 115–103)	*	2	5
To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps. (H.R. 4641)	*	*	*
Current Balance	–24	–14	–15
Changes to Revenues	0	1	4
Changes to Outlays	–24	–13	–11

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L. = Public Law; * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.

^a On October 26, 2017, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.
^e Pursuant to Division E of P.L. 115-96, the budgetary effects of divisions C and D are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO Scorecard.
^f Section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, granted the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee the authority to revise balances on the Senate PAYGO ledger to fully incorporate the budgetary effects of P.L. 115-97. The Chairman exercised this authority with a filing in the Congressional Record on December 19, 2017.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 115TH CONGRESS

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waiver ¹	Result
294	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1720 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—created a point of order against legislation that cuts Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid benefits.	313(b)(1)(A)-Byrd violation ²	Sen. Sanders (I-VT)	46-54, Not Waived.
295	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1854 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the Child Tax Credit.	302(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ³	Sen. Brown (D-OH)	48-52, Not Waived.
296	December 1, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1850 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—increased the refundability of the Child Tax Credit.	302(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ⁴	Sen. Rubio (R-FL)	29-71, Not Waived.
299	December 2, 2107.	S. Amdt. 1846 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—provided for middle class tax relief	4105-Unknown Budgetary Effects ⁵	Sen. Kaine (D-VA)	34-65, Not Waived.
301	December 2, 2017.	S. Amdt. 1717 to S. Amdt. 1618 to H.R. 1—struck title II	30(f)-Exceeds a committee's 302(a) allocation ⁶	Sen. Cantwell (D-WA)	48-52, Not Waived.
322	December 20, 2017.	H.R. 1—provided for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.	313(b)(1)—Byrd Rule violations ⁷	Sen. Enzi (R-WY)	51-48, Not Waived.
324	December 21, 2017.	H.R. 1370—continuing resolution	306-Budget Committee jurisdiction ⁸	Sen. Collins (R-ME)	91-8, Waived.

¹ All motions to waive were offered pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.
² Senator Enzi raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against the Sanders amendment because the amendment did not produce a change in outlays or a change in revenues and was extraneous to the reconciliation instruction.
³ Senator Enzi raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1854 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays.
⁴ Senator Wyden raised a 302(f) point of order as S. Amdt. 1850 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority or outlays.
⁵ Senator Toomey raised this point of order because the budgetary effects of the Kaine amendment were unknown at the time of consideration.
⁶ Senator Murkowski raised a 302(f) point of order because the Cantwell amendment, if adopted, would have caused the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to exceed its section 302(a) allocation of budget authority or outlays.
⁷ Senator Sanders raised a 313(b)(1)(A) point of order against section 11000(a), and 313(b)(1)(D) points of order against page 75, line 17 through page 76, line 9 and against the phrase "tuition-paying" as it appeared on page 309, line 12, and page 309, lines 14 through 15.
⁸ Senator Paul raised a section 306 point of order in relation to the statutory pay-go scorecard.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
 COOPERATION AGENCY,
 Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
 Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-80, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Belgium for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$6.53 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
 Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-80

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

- (i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Belgium
- (ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$4.53 billion
 Other \$2.00 billion
 Total \$6.53 billion

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
 Thirty-four (34) F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) Aircraft.

Thirty-eight (38) Pratt & Whitney F-135 Engines (34 installed, 4 spares).

Non-MDE: Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4I/CNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer; Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F-35 unique infrared flares; Reprogramming center; F-35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (BE-D-SAD).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 18, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Belgium—F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Aircraft

The Government of Belgium has requested to buy thirty-four (34) F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Conventional Take Off and Landing (CTOL) aircraft, and thirty-eight (38) Pratt & Whitney F-135 engines (34 installed, 4 spares). Also included are Electronic Warfare Systems; Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence/Communications, Navigational, and Identification (C4I/CNI); Autonomic Logistics Global Support System (ALGS); Autonomic Logistics

Information System (ALIS); Full Mission Trainer, Weapons Employment Capability, and other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities; F-35 unique infrared flares; Reprogramming center; F-35 Performance Based Logistics; software development/integration; aircraft ferry and tanker support; support equipment; tools and test equipment; communications equipment; spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documents; U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value is \$6.53 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of an ally and partner nation which has been, and continues to be, an important force for political and economic stability in Western Europe.

This proposed sale of F-35s will provide Belgium with a credible defense capability to deter aggression in the region and ensure interoperability with U.S. forces. The proposed sale will augment Belgium's operational aircraft inventory and enhance its air-to-air and air-to-ground self-defense capability. Belgium will have no difficulty absorbing these aircraft into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractors will be Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company, Fort Worth, TX; and Pratt & Whitney Military Engines, East Hartford, CT. This proposal is being offered in the context of a competition. If the proposal is accepted, it is expected that offset agreements will be required. All offsets are defined in negotiations between the Purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require multiple trips to Belgium involving U.S. Government and contractor representatives for technical reviews/support, program management, and training over the life of the program. U.S. contractor representatives will be required in Belgium to conduct Contractor Engineering Technical Services (CETS) and Autonomic Logistics and Global Support (ALGS) for after-aircraft delivery.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-80

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The F-35 Conventional Take-Off and Landing (CTOL) Block 3 aircraft is classified SECRET, except as noted below. It contains current technology representing the F-35 low observable airframe/outer mold line, Pratt & Whitney engine, radar, integrated core processor central computer, mission systems/electronic warfare suite, a multiple sensor suite, operational flight and maintenance trainers, technical data/documentation, and associated software. As the aircraft and its subsystems are under development, many specific identifying equipment/system nomenclatures have not been assigned to date. Sensitive and classified elements of the F-35 CTOL Block 3 aircraft include hardware, accessories, components, and associated software for the following major subsystems:

a. The Propulsion system is classified SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The single 40,000-lb thrust class engine is designed for low observability and has been integrated into the aircraft system. Pratt & Whitney, with the F-135, is developing and producing engine turbo machinery compatible with the F-35 and assures highly reliable, affordable performance. The engine is designed to be utilized in all F-35 variants, providing unmatched commonality and supportability throughout the worldwide base of F-35 users. The CTOL propulsion configuration consists of a main engine, diverterless supersonic inlet, and a Low Observable Axisymmetric Nozzle (LOAN).

b. The AN/APG-81 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) provides mission systems with air-to-air and air-to-ground tracks which the mission system uses as a component to sensor fusion. The AESA allows the radar to direct RF energy in a way that does not expose the F-35, allowing it to maintain low observability in high-threat environments. The radar subsystem supports integrated system performance for air-to-air missions by providing search, track, identification, and AIM-120 missile data link functionality. The radar also provides synthetic aperture radar mapping for locating surface targets and weather mapping for weather avoidance. The radar functions are tightly integrated, interleaved, and managed by an interface to sensor management functions within mission software. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

c. The Electro Optical Targeting System (EOTS) contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The EOTS subsystem to the sensor suite provides long-range detection and tracking, Infrared Search and Track (IRST) capability, a Forward-Looking Infrared (FLIR) sensor for precision tracking, and Bomb Damage Indication (BDI) capability. EOTS replaces multiple separate internal or podded systems typically found on legacy aircraft. The functionality of the EOTS employs the following modes: Targeting FLIR; Laser Range-Finding and Target Designation; EO DAS and EOTS Performance.

d. The Electro-Optical Distributed Aperture System (EODAS) is a subsystem to the sensor suite and provides full spherical coverage for air-to-air and air-to-ground detection and Navigation Forward Looking Infra-

red (NFLIR) imaging. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The NFLIR capability provides infrared (IR) imagery directly to the pilot's Helmet-Mounted Display (HMD) for navigation in total darkness, including takeoff and landing, and provides a passive IR input to the F-35's sensor fusion algorithms. The all-aspect missile warning function provides time-critical warnings of incoming missiles and cues other subsystems to provide effective countermeasure employment. EODAS also provides an IRST function that can create and maintain Situational Awareness-quality tracks (SAIRST). EODAS is a mid-wave Infrared (IR) system consisting of six identical sensors distributed around the F-35 aircraft. Each sensor has a corresponding airframe window panel integrated with the aircraft structure to meet aerodynamic and stealth requirements.

e. The Electronic Warfare (EW) system contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include: apertures; radio frequency (RF) and infrared (IR) countermeasures; and Electronic Countermeasures (ECM) techniques and features. The reprogrammable, integrated system provides radar warning and electronic support measures (ESM) along with a fully integrated countermeasures (CM) system. The EW system is the primary subsystem used to enhance situational awareness, targeting support and self defense through the search, intercept, location and identification of in-band emitters and to automatically counter IR and RF threats. The IR and RF countermeasures are classified SECRET. This system uses low signature-embedded apertures, located in the aircraft control surface edges, to provide direction finding and identification of surface and airborne emitters and the geo-location of surface emitters. The system is classified SECRET.

f. The Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence/Communications, Navigation, and Identification (C4I/CNI) system provides the pilot with unmatched connectivity to flight members, coalition forces, and the battlefield. It is an integrated subsystem designed to provide a broad spectrum of secure, anti-jam, covert voice and data communications, precision radio navigation and landing capability, self-identification, beyond visual range target identification, and connectivity with off-board sources of information. The functionality is tightly integrated within the mission system for enhanced efficiency and effectiveness in the areas of communications, navigation, identification, and sensor fusion. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. The CNI function includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. Sensitive elements of the CNI subsystems include:

(1) The VHF/UHF Voice and Data (Plain and Secure) Communication functionality includes air-to-air UHF/VHF voice and data, both clear and secure, to provide communications with other friendly and coalition aircraft, air-to-ground UHF voice to provide communications with ground sites, and intercommunication voice and tone alerts to provide communications between the avionics system and the pilot. UHF/VHF downlink of air vehicle status and maintenance information is provided to notify the

ground crews of the amounts and types of stores, fuel, and other supplies or equipment needed to quickly turn the aircraft for the next mission. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(2) The Tactical Air Navigation (TACAN) functionality provides operational modes to identify ground station and to provide bearing-to-station, slant range-to-ground station, bearing-to-airborne station and slant range to the nearest airborne station or aircraft. TACAN is not unique to the F-35 aircraft but is standard on most U.S. Air Force aircraft. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(3) The Identification Friend or Foe Interrogator and Transponder Identification functionality consists of integrated Mark XII Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) transponder capability to provide identification of other friendly forces. The CNI system supports sensor fusion by supplying data from IFF interrogations and off-board sources through the intra-flight data link. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(4) The Global Positioning System Navigation functionality includes the Global Positioning System (GPS) aided inertial navigation to provide high-quality positional navigation, and the Instrument Landing System (ILS)/Tactical Air Control and Navigation (TACAN) to provide navigation and landing cues within controlled airspace. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(5) The Multi-Function Advanced Data Link (MADL) is used specifically for communications between F-35 aircraft and has a very low probability of intercept, contributing to covert operations. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(6) The Inertial Navigation System is an all-attitude, Ring Laser Gyro-based navigation system providing outputs of linear and angular acceleration, velocity, body angular rates, position, altitude (roll, pitch, and platform azimuth), magnetic and true heading, altitude, and time tags. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(7) The Radar Altimeter functionality is a module provided in the CNI system rack 3A and uses separate transmit and receive antennae. It measures and reports altitude, and altitude rate of change. Control data is transferred over to a configurable avionics interface card which translates the information to the F-35 aircraft computers. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(8) The Instrument Landing System (ILS) measures, and reports azimuth course and alignment, elevation course alignment, and distance to the runway. Data from the ILS is used to drive visual flight instrumentation. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

(9) The Tactical Data Link is a secure broadcast Tactical Digital Information Link (TADIL) used for real-time voice/data exchange for command and control, relative navigation, and Precise Position Location Identification (PPLI), providing Link-16 type capabilities. The system contains both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET.

g. The F-35 Autonomic Logistics Global Sustainment (ALGS) includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. It provides a fully integrated logistics management solution. ALGS integrates a number of functional areas, including supply chain management, repair, support equipment, engine support, and training. The ALGS infrastructure employs a state-of-the-art information system that provides real-time, decision-worthy information for sustainment decisions by flight line personnel. Prognostic health monitoring technology is integrated with the air system and is crucial to the predictive maintenance of vital components.

h. The F-35 Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS) includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. The ALIS provides an intelligent information infrastructure that binds all of the key concepts of ALGS into an effective support system. ALIS establishes the appropriate interfaces among the F-35 Air Vehicle, the warfighter, the training system, government information technology (IT) systems, JSF operations, and supporting commercial enterprise systems. Additionally, ALIS provides a comprehensive tool for data collection and analysis, decision support, and action tracking.

i. The F-35 Training System includes both SECRET and UNCLASSIFIED elements. The Training System includes several types of training devices, to provide for integrated training of both pilots and maintainers. The pilot training device includes a Full Mission Simulator (FMS). The maintainer training devices include an Aircraft Systems Maintenance Trainer (ASMT), Ejection System Maintenance Trainer (ESMT), and Weapons Loading Trainer (WLT). The F-35 Training System can be integrated, where both pilots and maintainers learn in the same Integrated Training Center (ITC). Alternatively, the pilots and maintainers can train in separate facilities (Pilot Training Center and Maintenance Training Center).

j. Weapons employment capability is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include co-operative targeting.

k. Other Subsystems, Features, and Capabilities:

(1) The Low Observable Air Frame is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is classified SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: the Radar Cross Section and its corresponding plots, construction materials and fabrication.

(2) The Integrated Core Processor (ICP) Central Computer is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is classified SECRET. Sensitive elements include: F-35 Integrated Core Processor utilizing Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) Hardware and Module Design to maximize growth and allow for

efficient management of DMS and Technology Insertion, if additional processing is needed, a second ICP will be installed in the space reserved for that purpose, more than doubling the current throughput and memory capacity.

(3) The F-35 Helmet Mounted Display System (HMDS) is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: HMDS consists of the Display Management Computer-Helmet, a helmet shell/display module, a quick disconnect integrated as part of the ejection seat, helmet trackers and tracker processing, day- and night-vision camera functions, and dedicated system/graphics processing. The HMDS provides a fully sunlight readable, bi-ocular display presentation of aircraft information projected onto the pilot's helmet visor. The use of a night vision camera integrated into the helmet eliminates the need for separate Night Vision Goggles (NVG). The camera video is integrated with EO and IR imaging inputs and displayed on the pilot's visor to provide a comprehensive night operational capability.

(4) The Pilot Life Support System is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: a measure of Pilot Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Protection through use of an On-Board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS); and an escape system that provide additional protection to the pilot. OBOGS takes the Power and Thermal Management System (PTMS) air and enriches it by removing gases (mainly nitrogen) by adsorption, thereby increasing the concentration of oxygen in the product gas and supplying breathable air to the pilot.

(5) The Off-Board Mission Support System is SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. Information on performance and inherent vulnerabilities is SECRET. Software (object code) is SECRET. Sensitive elements include: mission planning, mission briefing, maintenance/intelligence/tactical debriefing, sensor/algorithm planning, EW system reprogramming, data debrief, etc.

1. Publications: Manuals are considered SECRET as they contain information on aircraft/system performance and inherent vulnerabilities.

2. The JSF Reprogramming Center is classified SECRET and contains technology representing the latest state-of-the-art in several areas. This hardware/software facility is located in the U.S. and provides F-35 customers a means to update JSF electronic warfare databases. Sensitive elements include: EW software databases and tools to modify these databases.

3. (U) If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of specific hardware, the information could be used to develop countermeasures which might reduce weapons system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. (U) A determination has been made that Belgium can provide substantially the same degree of protection for sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sustainment program is necessary to the furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the policy justification.

5. (U) All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Belgium.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, on December 21, 2017, Senator ISAKSON was necessarily absent for the vote on the continuing resolution. He intended to vote yea, and it was my intention to vote no. As a courtesy to Senator ISAKSON, I voted yea, in order to pair our votes.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL FRANK G. KLOTZ

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, I would like to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, USAF, Retired, upon his retirement as the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Today we pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, USAF, Retired for a distinguished career of nearly 45 years. His career began with his graduation in 1973 from the Air Force Academy and concludes when he steps down Friday after 4 years as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, NNSA.

Lieutenant General Klotz has excelled in many challenging positions. As commander of Air Force Global Strike Command, he established and led a new organization that merged responsibility for all U.S. nuclear-capable bombers and land-based missiles under a single chain of command. He also served as vice commander of the Air Force Space Command, director for Nuclear Weapons Policy and Arms Control on the National Security Council, and as a defense Attache to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. A Rhodes Scholar, General Klotz earned a master of philosophy in international relations and a doctor of philosophy in politics at Oxford University.

As Administrator of NNSA over the past 4 years, Lieutenant General Klotz has been responsible for maintaining the U.S. nuclear deterrent, preventing nuclear proliferation worldwide, and advancing the naval nuclear propulsion mission. These missions require extraordinary dedication, and our Nation is safer today because of his steadfast leadership.

Under his guidance, NNSA made significant advances in modernizing the nuclear stockpile and reversed a decades-long trend in the decline of America's nuclear weapons infrastructure. His commitment to reducing global nuclear threats ensured continued progress in removing dangerous nuclear materials from countries around the globe, and his personal engagement expanded partnerships with other countries to reduce the risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism.

Perhaps most importantly, Lieutenant General Klotz cared about his people. He worked tirelessly to improve the work environments of his people, increase the focus on safety and security, and foster a culture of pride,

employee engagement, and excellence across the nuclear security enterprise.

We enjoyed the many interactions we had with General Klotz. He was always happy to sit down and discuss any concerns we had and work with us to resolve those issues. He also worked closely with us to get large construction projects, like the Uranium Process Facility, on schedule and on budget.

His selfless commitment to serving our Nation has left us safer and better prepared to respond to threats around the world. He leaves a legacy of service, commitment to people, and dedication to our Nation. With our deepest gratitude, we wish him the very best in retirement after an impressive and impactful career.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS AND MARLYS SCHWADERER

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Curtis and Marlys Schwaderer for their many years of service to the community of Superior, MT, as owners of Mineral Pharmacy. For decades, Mineral Pharmacy has been a cornerstone business in the community, providing vital services for its people.

A graduate of the pharmacy school at the University of Montana, Curtis purchased the pharmacy 27 years ago. Together, he and his wife, Marlys, ran the business and raised two sons in the community. As Superior has struggled with the decline of the timber industry with rising unemployment and falling incomes, the Schwaderers and their business have been a constant and stabilizing presence, a beacon of certainty in uncertain times.

In November, after 43 years as pharmacist and 27 years at Mineral Pharmacy, Curtis retired, and he and Marlys announced they were selling the business. Under new ownership, the pharmacy continues to serve the community of Superior, and the Schwaderers themselves remain members of the community. The Schwaderers and Mineral Pharmacy are an excellent example of what committed community members and a business can mean to a small town. Every day, in small towns across Montana, you will find hard-working people like the Schwaderers and small businesses like Mineral Pharmacy working hard to keep our communities strong. They are truly the lifeblood of our State.

Thank you, Curtis and Marlys, for your many years of hard work and service to your community. I wish you all the best in your next chapter.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3326. An act to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank.

H.R. 3445. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3776. An act to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4258. An act to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4279. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise any rules necessary to enable closed-end companies to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers of securities.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex Diekmann Peak".

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 7:57 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 195) to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Fed-

eral Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3326. An act to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3776. An act to support United States international cyber diplomacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4258. An act to promote the development of local strategies to coordinate use of assistance under sections 8 and 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 with public and private resources, to enable eligible families to achieve economic independence and self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4279. An act to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise any rules necessary to enable closed-end companies to use the securities offering and proxy rules that are available to other issuers of securities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 2070, A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism (Rept. No. 115-200).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Dana Balocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

*James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

*Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2018.

*Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

*Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Carlos Trujillo.

Post: Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1,000, 12/22/2015, Carlos Lopez-Cantera for Senate.

2. Spouse: Carmen Maria Mir, None.

3. Children and Spouses: Carlos Manuel Trujillo, none; Isabella Alba Trujillo, none; Juan Pablo Trujillo, none; Felipe Andres Trujillo, none.

4. Parents: Georgina Hernandez, none; Ruben Trujillo, none.

5. Grandparents: Manuel Jose Fernandez, none; Alba Rosa Fernandez—deceased, none; Domingo Ruben Trujillo, none; Mirta Trujillo, none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David Trujillo, none; Gianina Trujillo, none; Catalina Trujillo, none; Ruben Trujillo, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Jennifer Hernandez, none.

*Joel Danies, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe.

Nominee: Joel Danies.

Post: Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: \$200, 10/19/2012, Obama for America.

2. Spouse: Caren Danies: \$200, 10/30/2016, Hillary Victory Fund.

3. Children and Spouses: Judson A. Danies 0; Blair H. A. Danies 0.

4. Parents: Edgard Danies—Deceased; Marie-Therese Daines—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: George Danies—Deceased; Lucy Danies—Deceased; Narbal Boucard—Deceased; Leoni Boucard—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Alexandra Hepler, 0.

*James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Nominee: James Randolph Evans.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and amount:

Self, Spouse, Children and Spouses, Parents, Grandparents, Brothers and Spouses, Sisters and Spouses: See Attachment A

ATTACHMENT A

Linda Evans, John McCallum for Congress, 2013—\$1,000.

Linda Evans, Pridemore for Congress, 2013—\$1,000.

Linda Evans, The Guardian Fund, 2013—\$1,000.

Linda Evans, Westmoreland, Lynn A., 2013—\$1,000.

Linda Evans, Shannon for Senate, 2014—\$1,000.

Linda Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., 2014—\$6,300.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2012—\$2,500.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2013—\$32,400.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2014—\$32,400.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2015—\$25,000.00.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016—\$270.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016—\$750.

J. Randolph Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2016—\$1,000.

J. Randolph Evans, Republican Party, Inc., 2017—\$225.

James Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2012, \$800.00.

James Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2012, \$1,000.00.

James Randolph Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, \$350.

Randy Evans, Romney for President, Inc., 2012, \$2,500.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2013, \$350.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, Inc., 2013, \$125.

Randy Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., Primary 2014, \$6,300.

Randy Evans, Nathan Deal for Governor, Inc., General 2014, \$6,300.

Randy Evans, Senate District 12, 2015, \$500.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, \$300.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, \$300.

Randy Evans, Republican National Committee, 2016, \$19,600.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, \$130.

Randy Evans, Donald J. Trump for President, Inc., 2016, \$2,700.

Randy Evans, Trump for President, 2016, \$25,000.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, \$270.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, \$750.

Randy Evans, Georgia Republican Party, 2016, \$1,000.

*Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nominee: Richard Allen Grenell.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Germany.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: \$1,000, 6/19/2013, Lindsey Graham; \$250, 9/11/2013, Mitch McConnell; \$1,000, 9/16/2014, Ed Royce; \$5,400, 6/05/2015, Rob Portman; \$1,000, 6/11/2005, John McCain.

2. Spouse: None.

3. Children and Spouses: None.

4. Parents: Judith Grenell, None; Denny Grenell—Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Nate Grenell—Deceased; Esther Grenell—Deceased; Rueben Pearson—Deceased; Gladys Pearson—Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Bradley Grenell, None; Jeffrey Grenell, None; Kerri Grenell, None; Jane Grenell, None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Deborah Grenell Kells, None; Dennis Kells, None.

*Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom.

*Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Verification and Compliance).

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Marc Clayton Gilkey and ending with Mark A. Myers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Alyce S. Ahn and ending with Michele D. Woonacott, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Priya U. Amin and ending with Erik Z. Zahnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Angela P. Aggeler and ending with Mari Jain Womack, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2018. (minus 1 nominee: Robert F. Grech)

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Barbara Stewart, of Illinois, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

*William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

*James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education.

*Brett Giroir, of Texas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

*Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

*Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

*Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

Elizabeth L. Branch, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Thomas Alvin Farr, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

William M. Ray II, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Liles Clifton Burke, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Michael Joseph Juneau, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Emily Coody Marks, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

Holly Lou Teeter, of Kansas, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

Mark Saalfield Norris, Sr., of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

R. Stan Baker, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

Charles Barnes Goodwin, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Matthew J. Kacsmaryk, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Eli Jeremy Richardson, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee.

Brian Allen Benczkowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

John H. Durham, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of four years.

Michael T. Baylous, of West Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

Daniel R. McKittrick, of Mississippi, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2319. A bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the national limitation amount for qualified highway or surface freight transfer facility bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2321. A bill to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to require the development of ethics plans for certain transition teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2322. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to define the term natural cheese; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 2323. A bill making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits and services in the event of a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2324. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 374. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 12, 2018, as "Darwin Day" and recognizing the importance of science in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. Res. 375. A resolution congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide access to magnetic EEG/EKG-guided resonance therapy to veterans.

S. 892

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1576

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1576, a bill to provide that the owner of a water right may use the water for the cultivation of industrial hemp, if otherwise authorized by State law.

S. 2055

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2055, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to better address substance use and substance use disorders among young people.

S. 2121

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2122

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2122, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding reasonable break time for nursing mothers.

S. 2147

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2147, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multi-employer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2152, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for assistance for victims of child pornography, and for other purposes.

S. 2159

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2159, a bill to require covered harassment and covered discrimination awareness and prevention training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered harassment and covered discrimination complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 2194

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2194, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. 2236

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2236, a bill to require covered discrimination and covered harassment awareness and prevention training for Members, officers, employees, interns, fellows, and detailees of Congress within 30 days of employment and annually thereafter, to require a biennial climate survey of Congress, to amend the enforcement process under the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights for covered discrimination and covered harassment complaints, and for other purposes.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2250, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms.

DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to prevent unfair double taxation by ensuring that the deduction for State and local taxes is not reduced, suspended, or eliminated.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2271, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 368

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 368, a resolution supporting the right of all Iranian citizens to have their voices heard.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2319. A bill to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about legislation I am introducing to spur American energy development on Federal land. This is the Opportunities for the Nation and States to Harness Onshore Resources for Energy Act. It is also known as the ONSHORE Act. It is a commonsense approach that streamlines the permitting process for oil and gas development.

Oil and gas production has increased dramatically on non-Federal land in recent years. Production on Federal land has fallen behind. That is because energy producers face costly delays when they have to deal with outdated and inefficient regulations from Washington, DC.

The legislation we are introducing reduces these unnecessary delays by giving authority to States that have established regulatory programs. Let's let the States make those decisions. These are States that have a proven track record of managing oil and gas development efficiently and effectively. At the same time, they protect

the public health and the environment. That is the balance we all want—and these States are doing it—without Washington adding another unnecessary layer of redtape.

In 2016, it took an average of more than 250 days for the Federal Bureau of Land Management to issue permits to drill for oil on public land. It took State agencies an average of 30 days. Look at the difference—States, 30 days; Federal, 250 days. That is the difference in what happens when Washington gets involved. The delays cost jobs, they slow down economic growth, and communities lose important tax revenue.

My home State of Wyoming is America's largest producer of natural gas, and we are the second largest producer of oil on Federal lands. Wyoming has a long history of managing oil and gas development on Federal lands. We know how to do it. We do it safely. We do it responsibly. Wyoming continues to be the place people from all over the world want to see because of how beautiful the scenery and the environment are. This legislation strips away that needless layer of Washington regulation, and it lets States like Wyoming manage oil and gas development the way we know how to do it.

Our legislation also eliminates the administrative fee that gets taken out of States' share of revenues from oil and gas production. Washington takes money that has been created locally, and it sends the money out of the community and back to Washington. This is millions of dollars that States and local communities need to fund vital public services. Our bill ends this unfair redistribution.

The ONSHORE Act also stops Washington from imposing extra permitting burdens and environmental reviews on energy development that takes place on non-Federal lands. These requirements are a classic example of Washington overreach. They don't help the environment; they just keep oil and gas in the ground and keep hard-working Americans out of work. This legislation will create jobs and expand our economy by creating an environment where American energy can dominate.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this legislation for their support—Senators HOEVEN, ENZI, LEE, and HATCH. I also want to thank my colleagues in the House for starting this conversation with their bill, which is called the SECURE American Energy Act. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation as quickly as possible.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the national limitation amount for qualified highway or surface freight transfer facility bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Building United States Infrastructure and Leveraging Development Act” or the “BUILT Act”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE NATIONAL LIMITATION AMOUNT FOR QUALIFIED HIGHWAY OR SURFACE FREIGHT TRANSFER FACILITY BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 142(m)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$15,000,000,000” and inserting “\$20,800,000,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to bonds issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 374—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 12, 2018, AS “DARWIN DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENCE IN THE BETTERMENT OF HUMANITY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 374

Whereas Charles Darwin developed the theory of evolution by the mechanism of natural selection, which, together with the monumental amount of scientific evidence Charles Darwin compiled to support the theory, provides humanity with a logical and intellectually compelling explanation for the diversity of life on Earth;

Whereas the validity of the theory of evolution by natural selection developed by Charles Darwin is further strongly supported by the modern understanding of the science of genetics;

Whereas it has been the human curiosity and ingenuity exemplified by Charles Darwin that has promoted new scientific discoveries that have helped humanity solve many problems and improve living conditions;

Whereas the advancement of science must be protected from those unconcerned with the adverse impacts of global warming and climate change;

Whereas the teaching of creationism in some public schools compromises the scientific and academic integrity of the education systems of the United States;

Whereas Charles Darwin is a worthy symbol of scientific advancement on which to focus and around which to build a global celebration of science and humanity intended to promote a common bond among all the people of the Earth; and

Whereas February 12, 2018, is the anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin in 1809 and would be an appropriate date to designate as “Darwin Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of “Darwin Day”; and

(2) recognizes Charles Darwin as a worthy symbol on which to celebrate the achievements of reason, science, and the advancement of human knowledge.

SENATE RESOLUTION 375—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2018 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 375

Whereas the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team won the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship, defeating the University of Georgia Bulldogs by a score of 26 to 23 at the Mercedes-Benz Stadium in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 10, 2018;

Whereas this victory marks the fifth College Football National Championship in the last 9 years for the University of Alabama and the 17th National Championship overall;

Whereas the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship was the 69th postseason football bowl appearance and the 39th football bowl victory for the University of Alabama;

Whereas the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team consistently showed perseverance in the midst of adversity, including overcoming a 13-point deficit in the second half of the National Championship game;

Whereas the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship game was the first National Championship game to extend into overtime;

Whereas head coach Nick Saban has now won 6 College Football National Championships, equaling the modern-era record of former University of Alabama football head coach Paul “Bear” Bryant;

Whereas this victory extends the record of Coach Saban to 127 wins and 20 losses in a decade of dominance;

Whereas “The Process”, as outlined by Coach Saban, has produced not only quality student-athletes, but well-rounded young men;

Whereas members of the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team have been honored by various awards throughout the season and during the postseason;

Whereas Chancellor Ray Hayes, President Stuart Bell, and Athletic Director Greg Byrne have emphasized the importance of academic success to the Crimson Tide football team and to all student-athletes at the University of Alabama; and

Whereas the 2017–2018 Crimson Tide football team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Alabama, the loyal fans of the Crimson Tide, and the entire State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Alabama Crimson Tide for winning the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship game;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the President of the University of Alabama, Dr. Stuart Bell;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Alabama, Greg Byrne; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team, Nick Saban.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1903. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

SA 1904. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1903 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1905. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1906. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1907. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1906 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1903. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 1904. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1903 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 1905. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 1906. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 1907. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1906 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the

amendment SA 1905 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael D. Griffin, of Alabama, to be Under Secretary for Research and Engineering, Phyllis L. Bayer, of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and John Henderson, of South Dakota, and William Roper, of Georgia, each to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “CFIUS Reform: Examining the essential elements.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Leon A. Westmoreland, of Georgia, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, Brendan Carr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, James Bridenstine, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner, and to be Chairman, and Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner, both of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, Janu-

ary 18, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, Richard Grenell, of California, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Verification and Compliance), James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg, Joel Danies, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Carlos Trujillo, of Florida, to be Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Melissa F. Burnison, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), and Anne Marie White, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary (Environmental Management), both of the Department of Energy.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Financial Aid Simplification and Transparency.”

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSION

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 18, 2018, at 12:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing subcommittee assignments and on the following nominations: Mitchell Zais, of South Carolina, to be Deputy Secretary, Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, and James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, all of the Department of Education, Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, Scott A. Mugno, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary, Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, all of the Department of Labor, Brett Giroir, of Texas, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Barbara Stewart, of Illinois, to be Chief Executive Offi-

cer of the Corporation for National and Community Service, and other pending nominations.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the House has sent us a bill that should be an easy “yes” vote for every Senator in this Chamber—an easy “yes” vote. This bill continues government funding, prevents a needless shutdown, and extends a key health insurance program for vulnerable children for 6 years. Its content is bipartisan. There are no provisions that any of my Democratic friends oppose. It is a simple step that will let us continue bipartisan talks without throwing the government into disarray for no reason.

Americans are surprised this is even a debate. I don’t blame them. I share their surprise that some Democratic Senators see the prospect of a government shutdown for more than 300 million Americans, see a possible lapse in health coverage for 9 million vulnerable American kids, and they have attempted to hold all of that hostage until we resolve a nonimminent problem related to illegal immigration.

The surprise is compounded for anyone who listens to the public statements of my Democratic colleagues and takes them at their word. Less than a week ago, the senior Senator from Colorado was asked whether it was prudent to shut the government down over the issue of illegal immigration. He insisted it was not.

Last month, my friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia, had this to say: “I’m not going to make 300 million people suffer because I can’t get the process working the way it should.”

The junior Senator from Virginia put it even more clearly. This is what he had to say: “I will exercise every bit of leverage I can . . . but if there is a vote that would lead to a shutdown, that is where I draw the line.”

Not more than 2 days ago, the senior Senator from Missouri said she wasn’t “interested in drawing a line in the sand” because “that’s how negotiations get blown up.”

Well, I hope their votes this evening reflect those recent statements.

Some of my colleagues say they are reluctant to support this measure not because of illegal immigration but simply because they are tired of continuing resolutions. They point out that this is a suboptimal way to fund our government, especially our warfighters.

That is precisely why Republicans worked hard all last month and all this month—all last month and all this month—to try to negotiate a long-term spending caps agreement that would bring stability back to government funding, but the Democratic leadership made it clear they would not be serious about these spending talks until this unrelated immigration issue was solved.

So now, unfortunately, a continuing resolution is the only option our Armed Forces have this evening. Let's not pretend for a moment—not a moment—that our men and women in uniform and their families benefit from a government shutdown.

This is how we got here. My Democratic colleagues' demand on illegal immigration, at the behest of their far-left base, have crowded out all other important business. They have crowded it all out over the issue of illegal immigration. Now they are threatening to crowd out the needs of veterans, military families, opioid treatment centers, and every other American who relies on the Federal Government, all over illegal immigration.

There is no imminent deadline facing the DACA Program. Congress has at least until March to arrive at a bipartisan solution that is acceptable to Republicans, Democrats, and the person who needs to sign the bill—the President of the United States. Do veterans, opioid treatment centers, and the families of fallen soldiers need to suffer before a compromise is reached?

Democratic Senators' fixation on illegal immigration has already blocked us from making progress on long-term spending talks. Now, that same fixation over illegal immigration has them threatening to filibuster funding for the whole government.

Years ago, my friend, the Democratic leader, described how irresponsible it would be to shut down the government over the issue of immigration. He said it would result in "governmental chaos." That is what my friend, the Democratic leader, said a while back, but earlier today on the floor, he insisted that we put every other American priority on hold—put it on hold—until we resolve immigration. Only then, he said, can we work on defense spending or domestic spending or CHIP or disaster relief—put all of that on hold over the issue of illegal immigration with no imminent deadline. It only needs to be addressed by March.

Well, that is apparently how our Democratic colleagues rank their priorities. It is not how I would rank mine. I don't think it is how many of our colleagues on either side would rank theirs either, but we will have a chance to find out in the coming days.

It is certainly not how the American people expect us to act. I think the American people clearly would not expect us to act this way.

The bill before us is an opportunity to correct course. It is a chance for my colleagues to remember that we represent millions and millions of American citizens.

The American people want the Federal Government open for veterans, military families, and the vulnerable. They want food and drug inspections to continue without interruption. They want death benefits to continue to go out to the families of servicemembers killed in action. They want children in low-income families to continue receiv-

ing health coverage through SCHIP. They want a sensible compromise on immigration. But they cannot for the life of them understand why—why—some Senators would hold the entire country hostage until we arrive at a solution to a problem that doesn't fully materialize until March.

Military families, veterans, and children benefiting from the SCHIP program don't need to be shoved aside—they don't need to be shoved aside—while we continue good-faith negotiations. So we ought to pass this resolution, and we ought to get back to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will have much more to say after this vote on the motion to proceed, which Democrats will support because we want to move forward. We want to get something done. We don't want to keep kicking the can down the road. But I just had to answer the leader, briefly.

The leader is looking to deflect blame, but it just won't work. We all know what the problem is; it is complete disarray on the Republican side.

The bottom line is very simple. Our Republican leader has said that he will not negotiate until he knows where President Trump stands. That is why negotiations haven't gotten anywhere. Let me quote. Here is what the leader said just yesterday: "I am looking for something that President Trump is going to support, and he has not yet indicated what measure he is willing to sign." MITCH MCCONNELL said that he still has to "figure out what the President is for." How can you negotiate when the President, who has to sign the legislation, is like a sphinx on this issue or says one thing one day and one thing the next?

So here is what we can do to solve the problem. We could solve it right now. The four leaders could sit down—there has been a lot of discussion—and come to an agreement and do what the President said at one point: Send it to his desk and he will sign it. We could get that done before the deadline of tomorrow night expires, or we could give the President a few days to come to the table, now that he knows this plan won't work, and we could get this done in a few short days and not kick the can down the road.

This is the fourth CR that we have done and accomplished nothing. There is no promise and no likelihood that another kicking of the can down the road will get something done. We have to sit down together and solve this, with the President or without. Until that happens, no amount of CRs will get this done.

I would suggest we all vote for the motion to proceed but instead move a very short-term CR, and we will either negotiate it ourselves or the President will join us, and we can get the job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, not to prolong the debate, but the Presidency under our constitutional system is not irrelevant. He is the person who signs things into law. And most of us in the House and Senate on the Republican side are interested in what his views are, and those have not been made fully apparent yet.

What we have before us deals with a real emergency—tomorrow night at midnight. What our friends on the other side are pushing is not an emergency. It doesn't have anything to do with what is before us. It is completely irrelevant to the issue of avoiding a government shutdown and taking care of 300 million Americans, most of whom depend on the government in one way or another.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 195 and ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Durbin	Manchin
Baldwin	Enzi	Markey
Barrasso	Ernst	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	McConnell
Blumenthal	Fischer	Menendez
Blunt	Flake	Merkley
Booker	Gardner	Moran
Boozman	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Brown	Graham	Murphy
Burr	Grassley	Murray
Cantwell	Harris	Nelson
Capito	Hassan	Perdue
Cardin	Hatch	Peters
Carper	Heinrich	Portman
Casey	Heitkamp	Reed
Cassidy	Heller	Risch
Cochran	Hirono	Roberts
Collins	Hoeven	Rounds
Coons	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Sanders
Cornyn	Johnson	Sasse
Cortez Masto	Jones	Schatz
Cotton	Kaine	Schumer
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott
Cruz	King	Shaheen
Daines	Klobuchar	Shelby
Donnelly	Lankford	Smith
Duckworth	Leahy	Stabenow

Sullivan	Udall	Wicker
Tester	Van Hollen	Wyden
Thune	Warner	Young
Tillis	Warren	
Toomey	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Lee Paul

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the Message from the House.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 195) entitled “An Act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.”, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

I ask unanimous consent that there now be up to 10 minutes of debate, equally divided, on the motion to concur and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would simply like to read a statement from Dana W. White, chief Pentagon spokesperson:

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

The leader wants to move that very CR that the Pentagon objects to even without a 60-vote margin. I strenuously object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Roy Blunt.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with an amendment numbered 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1904 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1904 to amendment No. 1903.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1905

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions, being amendment numbered 1905.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1906 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1907 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1906

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1907 to amendment No. 1906.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, to delay a vote on cloture makes no sense when we all know the outcome. The government’s funding expires tomorrow night at midnight. Let’s vote tonight on cloture so we can move forward so, perhaps, we can bring the President to the table—if not, so we can undergo serious negotiations to get things done.

You have just heard from the Pentagon. The Pentagon thinks this CR is wrong for our military. This is again the statement from Dana White, the chief Pentagon spokesperson. I want to repeat it so my colleagues can all hear it.

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

Because of the urgent needs we face—the military and so many of the others: opioids, veterans, pensions—we should not delay any further. We should move cloture tonight and see the outcome—I think we all know it will be defeated—and start serious negotiations tomorrow morning. That is what we should do.

I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived and that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion filed on the motion to

concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 ripen at 10 p.m. on Thursday, January 18—10 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the leader addressed extensively what was happening before the vote on the motion to proceed. I would like to address that now.

The House of Representatives has sent the Senate a continuing resolution that has been constructed by the Republican Speaker and passed without the consultation of House Democrats or Senate Democrats, whatsoever. The Republican leader is now saying to us: Take it or leave it.

Here is why Members from both sides of the aisle want to leave it. We have been skating by on continuing resolution after continuing resolution for almost 6 months. First, we passed a 3-month CR. Then we passed a 2-week CR and then a 1-month CR. Now we are offering another month-long delay of the inevitable.

We cannot keep kicking the can down the road and shuffling our feet after it. In another month, we will be right back here at this moment with the same web of problems at our feet and in no better position to solve them. The government of the most powerful nation in the world should, simply, not be run this way.

These successive, short-term funding bills hurt our military, as I have mentioned. Just ask Secretary Mattis if this is what he would prefer we do—another continuing resolution—or an honest to goodness budget that allows our Defense Department to plan ahead and meet its obligations. We all know he would prefer the latter.

That is why some of my Republican colleagues have already said they join with Democrats to reject this bill. They know, like I know, that this is no way to do our business. This is not a partisan issue. We should be united in trying to come to a solution, not just kick the can down the road.

The truth is that we don't have to do it this way. In his speech earlier, the majority leader, my friend, tried to reduce this to a binary choice: Take my bill or else shut down the government.

That is not the case. It is simply not. These aren't the only options available to him or to any of us. Democrats and Republicans have been negotiating for months about several issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach on lifting the caps for both defense and domestic spending, on healthcare issues, on disaster relief, on immigration issues. A bipartisan deal is within reach. I have been a part of those negotiations on all of these issues, and now is the time to reach it, not a month from now.

One reason we haven't gotten one already, frankly, is that the President

has been impervious to compromise for several months. Another is that he cannot maintain a consistent position. We all know that. He accepts bipartisan overtures on one day only to reject them on the next. He makes and then rescinds and then remakes demands. He encourages compromise one day only to thwart it the next by saying he will only accept a deal that gives him 100 percent of what he wants. That is not what a great deal maker does.

Folks, the people in Congress in his own party don't even know what he wants. I feel for them. I feel for our leader. He is in an awful, difficult position. I know that. We all know that. Yesterday, Leader MCCONNELL said that he is still trying to figure out what the President is for. Only a few moments ago, the leader said the President's views have not been made fully apparent yet. Letting this ambivalence and chaos continue for another month is just not the answer. It is not a good way to get a deal. It is not the right way to run our country—our dear, beloved country.

Tonight or tomorrow, the President will see—I had hoped it would be tonight; we cannot waste any time—that this approach was rejected on a bipartisan basis. Hopefully, he will see the light, come to the table, and negotiate seriously for the first time in this lengthy process.

Ultimately, the answer here might be to pursue an idea that has been floated by a few of my Republican colleagues—pass a clean extension of government funding for 4 or 5 days to give us a hard, final deadline to finalize a deal. Passing a short-term continuing resolution ensures that both sides remain at the table and can quickly reach a deal that funds our military, our domestic priorities, like the fight against opioids, that protects Dreamers, and that funds healthcare and aid for those harmed by recent disasters. Everyone in this Chamber wants some of those things, if not all.

Frankly, I think we can still solve this by the deadline tomorrow. As my friend from South Carolina said: We could solve all of this in 30 minutes if only folks were willing. It may not quite be 30 minutes, but knowing the negotiations as I do, we could do it rather quickly. Certainly, it wouldn't take us 30 days.

Hopefully, after the CR goes down, folks will be willing, and with a little more time on our hands, maybe the majority leader—we are trying to help you, MITCH—can pin down just what President Trump wants in order to get a deal. Nobody wants to shut down the government. Democrats don't want to shut down the government, and Republicans don't want to shut down the government. I believe that sincerely. The only person who has ever rooted for a shutdown, frankly, is our President, who said our country could use a good shutdown. Only President Trump could come up with that phrasing. Nobody

else thinks it is a good shutdown. Of course, no shutdown can be good for the American people. Let us strive to avoid one.

I urge my colleagues to reject this measure for the reasons I mentioned. It was not fair. We were not consulted. It was take it or leave it. That is not how it should work. That is how almost none of us want this to work.

If we cannot figure this out by tomorrow night, I urge the majority leader, in particular, and the majority to support a clean extension of funding for a few days so that we can finally come to a resolution and get down to so many of the other things that we need to do in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this is not terribly complicated.

We have been in discussions for a couple of months on all of the issues that are urgent—the funding of the government, the Children's Health Insurance Program—and other matters that we all know need to be dealt with.

My good friend, the Democratic leader, is saying we have had too many continuing resolutions but suggests we pass yet another one, and the bill that is before us that we just voted to proceed to, I believe, enjoys the support—every element of it enjoys the support of almost everybody on both sides of the aisle. So it is appropriate to ask the question, Why are we where we are? There is only one reason: the continuous interjection of an issue, about which there is no urgency, into a discussion about how to deal with a potpourri of issues that do need to be urgently met, and that is the issue of illegal immigration.

So what our friends on the other side are saying is, they are prepared to shut down the government over the issue of illegal immigration. On that issue, there is a bipartisan interest in solving the DACA problem, but the President has given us until March. The last time I looked this was January. My colleagues, where is the urgency here? There isn't any.

So the reason these talks have gone on so long is because they have insisted, continuously, on throwing the illegal immigration issue into the pool of these other issues and are now saying to the American people: We are going to shut the government down if we can't have our way on this issue right now, even though it only becomes a problem in March.

So I hope the American people understand why we are where we are. No amount of trying to obfuscate this and confuse it with all of these other issues makes any sense at all. There is pretty broad bipartisan agreement that we need to address every single one of these issues, but the reason we are here right now is, our friends on the other side say: Solve this illegal immigration problem right now or we are going to shut the government down. That is a

fact. That is not spin. That is a fact. That is the only reason why we are where we are tonight. So I hope the American people will not be confused about this.

We want to fund the government. We want to solve the S-CHIP problem and a variety of other issues that almost all others agree on, and we wanted to do it before tomorrow night, but my assumption is at some point between now and tomorrow night, 41 Members of the opposition party are going to prevent us from passing a measure, the details of which they all support, because they can't get their way on this illegal immigration issue which really only becomes urgent in March.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just a brief rejoinder. First, there have been very good attempts, bipartisan attempts to solve this problem. Three Democrats and three Republicans met the problem right in the middle. It was the other side, your side, Leader, that didn't want to go along with that agreement. It was a fair and decent agreement in which each side gave. It is an important agreement. It is a vital agreement, and no one—no one—no one—has figured out a way to pass a bill independently in February. Any vote, any bill that might get a majority of the Republicans in the House on this issue will not get Democrats, and any bill that gets a majority of Democrats will not get a majority of the Republican side in the House and will not be put on the floor. So this is the way to go on that issue, but there are many other issues out here too. Make no mistake about it.

Opioids. Our national lifespan rate has declined, how long we live has declined because of opioids. We haven't funded it. Every one of us in our States knows we need that. This resolution does nothing on opioids.

Veterans. In my State and in your States, veterans are waiting in line for treatment after they risked their lives for us. This resolution doesn't fund it. You say: Well, maybe we will do it after a month, but we sure haven't done it for 6 months.

What about pensions? The millions of Americans, working people, who have paid in month after month who lost salary—they declined salary increases so they would know they could live a life of decency—hardly wealth—when they retire, that is being extinguished. We have an urgent obligation to deal with those people. We feel it, and I know many people on the other side feel it.

There are so many other issues. Healthcare issues. I see my friend from Maine. We had a discussion last night, and I talked subsequently to my friend from Washington State and my friend from Florida. We could come to an arrangement on that rather quickly and deal with that issue.

Disaster relief for Texas, for Florida, for Puerto Rico, and for the West. We

need to deal with that issue as well. So there are lots of issues to deal with, and on all of these important issues, all of them, this resolution kicks the can down the road and gives us no reason to believe it will be any different than the first CR, the second CR, the third CR, and the fourth CR.

What we are proposing is not original with us. It was proposed by three or four Members on that side of the aisle. A very short-term increase would force the President to the table, hopefully, because that has been the barrier, in the words of the majority leader, for solving the DACA problem and other issues and would get us to act. These are not such easy issues. Without a deadline, we may never get them done, and the fears of the Pentagon, so well stated tonight by the DOD spokesperson, will get worse and worse and worse.

So I would, in an act of bipartisanship—not accusing one side or the other—I didn't accuse one side or the other of shutting down the government. I am not trying to play for political points, even false ones. I am trying to get us to come together in a bipartisan nature to get something done. I hope all of us on both sides of the aisle rise to the occasion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader has mentioned a variety of issues, all of which were being discussed over the last 2 months in the hopes that we could reach an agreement to address them all. So now, I gather, he is saying he opposes the bill because it doesn't have everything we have been talking about in it, even though the things that are in the bill he does like. So the complaint now is, it doesn't have the other issues in it. The reason it doesn't have the other issues in it is because we haven't been able to reach a global agreement on how much we are going to spend.

These talks have been going on endlessly. Many of you have not been involved in them. We are exhausted. On and on and on we have been talking about all this—everything the Democratic leader has mentioned. Why will they never let us reach an agreement? Illegal immigration. That is what they shoehorned into all this—shoehorned that issue right into this and said: We will not solve any of this other stuff until we deal with this.

Now I gather the Democratic leader is questioning the good faith of some of us about whether we want to deal with the DACA issue. I do. I see Senator COTTON back here, Senator TILLIS—I think we all would like to deal with the DACA issue, but there are some serious problems with legal immigration, and this is a big enough issue to warrant being discussed all by itself without being shoehorned into a bill full of real emergencies because there is no real emergency in the immigration area. We have until March to deal with it.

So make no mistake about it, we are where we are for one reason and one reason only, within a day of a government shutdown, and that is the insistence of our friends on the other side that we deal with this nonemergency right now because they were unwilling to close out all of these other issues we have been discussing ad nauseam, literally for months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the majority leader clarifying for us what this is all about, and actually I have to thank the Democratic leader for clarifying that this is really about the issue of illegal immigration. That is the reason there has been no agreement on spending caps, because our friends across the aisle don't want to agree on spending caps because they want to use everything else as leverage in order to get an outcome on this dispute over illegal immigration.

As the majority leader pointed out, this isn't so much about what is in the bill as what they said should be in the bill because I presume our colleagues are for the 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which was voted almost unanimously out on a bipartisan basis in the Senate Finance Committee. The matter of veterans that the Democratic leader mentioned—well, veterans are going to be hurt by what they have done or will do tomorrow, I presume, in defeating this 1-month continuing resolution.

I find it rather disingenuous to say we are against this short-term continuing resolution because we want another short-term continuing resolution, guaranteeing that there will yet again be another short-term resolution. Once the spending caps are agreed to, it is going to take a couple of weeks for the bill to be put together so we can actually vote on it. So our colleagues across the aisle who say they want another 3- or 4-day continuing resolution, that guarantees yet another continuing resolution, and all of this is really camouflage to hide their true intention—as the majority leader pointed out—trying to force a decision where there is yet not consensus and a willingness of the President to support it on the issue of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. That deadline for people who can no longer re-sign up is March 5. In the meantime, nobody is in any jeopardy, none of the 690,000 young people who were brought here as children are in any kind of jeopardy, and we are having discussions on a daily basis. We had one today with Senator DURBIN, STENY HOYER, the Democratic whip; the majority leader in the House, KEVIN MCCARTHY; and I again met with the White House and Department of Homeland Security to try to make some progress, and I think there was the beginning of some real progress toward a resolution.

I find it disingenuous to try to claim that we are killing this 1-month CR,

continuing resolution, because we don't want to hurt the military. This damages the military because it creates further chaos and uncertainty when it comes to a long-term spending deal because our military has been underfunded for way too long. Why? Because our Democratic colleagues will not agree to fund our national defense until we agree to raise spending on nondefense matters. So it strikes me as very odd that you would say you are voting against this continuing resolution because you are against continuing resolutions only to guarantee that we will have at least two more and then to claim it is about something else, when really it is about the matter of illegal immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that what we are trying to achieve is fund the military and critical agencies of our government immediately and to do it with a budget, to do it with appropriations bills. I have to use that term and remind you, yes, we used to have appropriations bills in the U.S. Senate—not anymore. We deal with continuing resolutions, we lurch from week to week, day to day, month to month, and as the Secretary of Defense has told us, we are not doing the men and women of the military any favors with this kind of approach. Make no mistake about it, the Democrats are soundly behind national security, and we want to fund them properly rather than the way they have been funded to this date.

Let me address another issue that has been raised—and my name has been mentioned by my friend from Texas. It has been said on the floor tonight that there is no urgency. Where's the urgency when it comes to DACA? Where is the urgency when it comes to Dreamers? If you want to know the urgency, look into the Gallery behind me. Look at the people who have gathered here late this night, who are following every word that we are debating. Why are they here if there is no urgency?

There is an urgency. There is an urgency in their lives because of the uncertainty of tomorrow—whether tomorrow will mean deportation for themselves and their families, whether they will be able to work, complete school, have a life in America. Yes, there is a real urgency, and let me tell you what we have done about that urgency.

A group of us—three Democrats and three Republican Senators—sat down 4 months ago to answer President Trump's challenge to replace DACA. Was there a meeting of a committee in this Senate on the same subject? There was one public hearing, but no bill, no markup, nothing. The activity really came from and evolved from the six of us working together—three Democrats and three Republicans. We reached an agreement. It wasn't easy. Ask the Senators involved on your side of the

aisle or on our side of the aisle. We have presented it to the Senate, we have defended it over the last several weeks, and I want to thank the additional four Republican Senators who have joined us in this effort to finally enact a bipartisan solution to this. So to say that we have done nothing and we have so much time—let me tell you, there is a sense of urgency here.

Just this week, when the Secretary of DHS testified before the Judiciary Committee, she conceded the fact that the President does not have authority to extend this deadline of March 5, that we are going back and forth in court as to whether there will be any protection for these young people whatsoever, and she acknowledged that her Department has said that it will take them 6 months to write the regulations once we pass the law that will affect their lives and the lives of hundreds of thousands.

You know how I feel about this issue. Some of you have presided over the Senate, have seen the presentations we have made over the years. I have brought 107 photographs to the floor so that people could see the urgency and need for this issue now. It is sad; it is unfortunate that those who stand on the floor tonight continue to characterize these as illegal immigrants—illegal immigrants. Children, toddlers, infants brought to the United States, who have lived their whole lives here and are simply asking for a chance to be part of our future, are being swept away as illegal immigrants. They are more than that. They are the sons and daughters of America who want to be part of our future. They are people who inspire me every day. They are folks who guarantee us that the American Dream will be alive for another generation because they are willing to work for it, to study for it, and to fight for it. This is worth our attention.

We have produced this bipartisan measure. A lot of hard work went into it. We would simply ask that the Senate take up the measure that we produced or produce a better one, and the leadership has refused. That is part of the reason we find ourselves at this moment, but I want to assure you, it is an urgent matter. Their lives matter too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The majority leader.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Friday, January 19; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KING. I don't understand why we are adjourning when we are in this urgent situation. We could vote tonight on cloture and have an entire day tomorrow to work on this matter. This is irresponsible, and I just don't understand it, so I object to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request that I propounded earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:15 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 19, 2018, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

KENNETH STEVEN BARBIC, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE TODD A. BATTIA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THOMAS E. AYRES, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE GORDON O. TANNER.

JAMES N. STEWART, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE TODD A. WEILER.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

JOHN F. RING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2022, VICE PHILIP ANDREW MISCIMARRA, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICES

MICHAEL STOKER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR, VICE ALLISON BECK, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FRANCIS R. FANNON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (ENERGY RESOURCES), VICE JOHN STERN WOLF.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JOHNATHAN MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

JACKIE WOLCOTT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

UNITED NATIONS

JACKIE WOLCOTT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE VIENNA OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL L. AHMANN
COL. PETER G. BAILEY
COL. MALINDA M. BEGGS
COL. ERIC L. BRATU
COL. BENJAMIN M. CASON
COL. MARK A. CHIDLEY
COL. TROY T. DANIELS
COL. NICHOLAS A. GENTILE, JR.
COL. THOMAS F. GRABOWSKI
COL. ANDREW W. LOVE
COL. RICHARD R. NEELY
COL. RUSSELL L. PONDER
COL. DONNA M. PRIGMORE
COL. ROBERT D. REYNER
COL. JAMES A. ROBERTS
COL. RAYMOND S. ROBINSON IV
COL. JAMES P. RYAN
COL. DARRIN E. SLATEN
COL. CHRISTOPHER L. SMITH
COL. JEFFREY S. SMITH
COL. JUSTIN B. SMITH
COL. MARK A. WEBER
COL. JEFFREY L. WILKINSON
COL. JOHN P. YORK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER R. ALDERDICE
COL. ROBERT S. GRANT
COL. PAUL N. LOISELLE
COL. WAYNE M. MCCAUGHEY
COL. DAVID J. MOUNKES

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ERIC J. WESLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THEODORE D. MARTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. SUSIE S. KUILAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LESLIE C. SMITH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MATTHEW J. KOHLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHNNY R. WOLFE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN C. RING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT D. CONN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY L. ADAMS
COL. MARK A. HASHIMOTO
COL. KARL D. PIERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JIN HWA LEE FRAZIER
STEVEN J. GROCKI
CURTIS S. KATES
SANDRA M. KENT
ANDREW T. KROG
TYLER E. MERKEL
REBECCA C. SALISBURY
JACK DAVID SPENCER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

COREY L. ANDERSON
STEPHEN C. AUSBAND
BRADLEY G. BUTLER
SHANNON D. FABER
ISAAC J. FAIBISOFF
BRIAN V. FAVERO
IFEOMA S. IZUCHUKWU
ROBYN T. KRAMER
JERRY A. POWELL, JR.
JENNIFER R. RATCLIFF
CHRISTOPHER R. SPINELLI
ROBERT K. TALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL C. MAINE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MELISSA A. DAY
GWYN MARY PARRISATWELL
DAVID J. SCHIEBER
ROBERTA J. STEMEM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MATTHEW M. BIRD
GREGORY GAITERS
SCOTT D. HANING
CALEB J. KING
DAWNLEE J. ROBERSON
BRYAN T. RUSSELL
DOUGLAS T. SIMONS
PAUL KELLEY STROUD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HOLLY L. BREWER
ARI JAY FISHER
JULIE C. SMITH
MARIO TOMMASI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN G. ANDRADE
CARL R. ARMOUR
JASON E. BAKER
BRIAN T. BALDWIN
LANCE EDGAR BAXTER
GREGORY B. BERRY
BRIAN DAVID BIGGS
ERIK G. BRINE
GREGORY D. BUCHANAN
GREGORY K. BULES
THOMAS S. BUTLER
BRUCE A. CARPER
KARYN L. CHRISTEN
JOANNA L. COLLINS
GERALD M. COOK
BRIAN R. CUSSON
PAUL R. DELANO, JR.
CHERYL M. DELOUGHERY
MICHAEL A. DESANTIS
CHARLES L. DESTEFANI
JAMES B. DICKEY
SHERARD C. DORROH
BRANDON M. DOUGLASS
KAREN MARIE DOWNES
ALLEN E. DUCKWORTH
WENDI T. DUFFY
JUSTIN H. DUNCAN
DANIEL J. EBRECHT
CHARLES H. EMBS
THOMASMORE J. EPISCOPIO
MARK J. ESTLUND
BRIAN E. FERGUSON
DION R. FLYNN

ANTHONY J. FRANKS
DEANNA K. FRANKS
MATTHEW M. FRITZ
ROBERTO GARCIA
COURTNEY A. HAMILTON
LARA A. HAUGHT
CHRISTOPHER G. HAWN
CAROLYN K. HEPP
BRIAN DAVID HOLLIS
TRINA RENEE HOOD
KENNETH M. JAMBOR
DOUGLAS C. JANKOVICH
ROBERT B. JAYME
SCOTT W. JONES
LEO J. KAMPHAUS, JR.
FRANK R. KINCAID
GREGORY M. KUZMA
CHRISTOPHER K. LACOUTURE
RYAN J. LANDMANN
MICHAEL D. LEONAS
DAVID C. LIONBERGER IV
DANIEL A. LOVING
PHILLIP D. LUTS
MICHAEL S. MALONEY
MARILYN G. MANFOLD
VALERIE M. MANNING
JOSEPH T. MARCINEK
JAMES JOSEPH MATTEY
MICHAEL S. MAY
MAUREEN HELEN MCALLEN
DWIGHT D. MEESE
CHARLES J. METZGAR
ADAM J. MEYERS
JAY D. MILLER
JENNIFER L. MULDER
JANEL MARIE NELSON
ANNE BREDTHAUER NOEL
TARA E. NOLAN
ISAAC S. OH
BRIAN D. OSWALT
RACHEL R. OUELLETTE
BRETT R. PAOLA
SCOTT D. PETERSON
CURTIS L. PITTS
CHARLES VINCENT PRATT
STEVEN C. PRIEST
JEFFREY M. PRINDLE
KEVIN L. RAINY
SEAN M. RASSAS
CHRISTOPHER T. RECKER
WAYLON S. RICHARDS
TODD D. RIDDLE
JOHN F. ROBINSON
RICHARD C. ROPAC
TRAVIS M. ROWLEY
CHRISTOPHER E. SEDLACEK
DAVID E. SHAHADY
DONALD C. SIEGMUND
KAREN A. SLOCUM
XAVIERA SLOCUM
JAY MICHAEL SMELTZER
JASON L. SMITH
STEPHEN D. SMITH, JR.
ELTRESSA D. SPENCER
MICHAEL D. STAPLETON
SHARON A. STEHLIK
KANDACE M. STEINBRINK
REX H. STEVES
BRYAN A. STONE
DANIEL D. STOUT
GARRETT C. STUMB
KRISTOFER S. TERRY
PATRICIA THOMAS
ROBERT TAYLOR THOMPSON
THOMAS J. THOMSEN
WILLIAM SCOTT TILLMAN
PETER A. TORTORICI, JR.
STERLING E. TREE
JOHN D. UPTEGROVE
MARK D. VAN BRUNT
WILLIAM B. VAUGHN
BRENT E. WEISNER
TIMOTHY M. WELTER
SHAWN P. WERCHAN
CHRISTOPHER DAVID WITTER
LAWRENCE P. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSHUA M. KOVICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID M. DERSCH, JR.
WILLIAM L. HOGGATT
ANDREW C. PAK
PATRICK J. TRAVERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LANCE J. KIM
JONATHAN D. KING
MATHEW J. ROYAL
DEREK V. SCHOP
SONIA W. S. TAOYI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID L. WELLS II

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOCELYN A. LEVENTHAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALYSSA S. ADAMS
JUDITH K. BOYD
JUNG W. CHOI
JOHN M. COOPER
JOSEPH A. FEDORKO
ERIC J. FEUSTEL
TIMOTHY D. HAMILTON
DAVID B. HODGKINSON
ELIZABETH A. JAENICKE
KEVIN C. KAKAC
MYRNA A. MESA
BLAKE E. STONE
RICHARD A. SUGARMAN
BRADLEY O. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*KENNETH S. KATROSH
DOLLY R. LIVINGSTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*JOSEPH KLOIBER
PAUL NAVAS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ERICK C. CREWS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*MICHAEL C. BRADWICK
DAVID A. GROVES
DOUGLAS S. YOON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ZACHARY T. BUSENBARK
ELLIOT S. GRANT
RUSSELL A. MOORE
DAVID A. SAMBRONEDARKINS
JAIME A. SANJUAN RUBIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

*To be major*GABBY V. CANCERAN
JOHN P. CROSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ADAM T. SOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 4336(A):

To be colonel

PHILIP J. DACUNTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LYLE A. OURADA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

SHERRY M. KWON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON A. PARISH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

HISHAM K. SEMAAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

To be lieutenant commander

PAUL I. AHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

ALLEN G. GUNN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM DOCTOR, JR.
LINA M. DOWNING
WILLIAM M. SCHRADER
SCOTT E. VASQUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JUSTIN J. ANDERSON
JUSTIN J. ANSEL, JR.
THOMAS A. ATKINSON
ANTHONY J. BANGO
DAVID M. BANNING
JOHN C. BARRY
SHAWN B. BELTRAN
GARRETT L. BENSON
CHRISTOPHER J. BRONZI
JASON P. BROWN
SHAWN J. BUDD
WALTER J. BUTLER, JR.
SCOTT E. COBE
DANIEL H. COLEMAN
COREY M. COLLIER
JAMES B. CONWAY
BRIAN P. COYNE
JOHN Y. DELATEUR
KEVIN L. DIGMAN
FRANK DIORIO, JR.
WILLIAM P. DONNELLY III
ERIC J. DOUGHERTY
BRIAN S. DRYZGA
AMY R. EBITZ
JUSTIN W. EGGSTAFF
JOSEPH A. FARLEY
MICHAEL J. FITZGERALD
TRAVIS T. GAINES
JEREMY L. GETTINGS
STEVE E. GILLETTE
MATTHEW T. GOOD
EDWARD C. GREILEY
ROBERT J. GUICE
ERIC J. HAMSTRA
GABRIELLE M. HERMES
CHRISTOPHER L. HOLLOWAY

ROBERT A. HUBBARD
BENJAMIN K. HUTCHINS
RICHARD D. JOYCE
JEFFREY R. KENNEY
BRIAN T. KOCH
SCOTT M. KOLTICK
KEVIN R. KORPINEN
DEREK E. LANE
LUIS F. LARA
VINCENT G. LARATTA
JOHN G. LEHANE
FREDERICK L. LEWIS, JR.
DEVIN O. LICKLIDER
MICHAEL J. LIVINGSTON
BRADLEY M. MAGRATH
TODD M. MANYX
DONALD G. MARASKA
KRISTIN L. MCCANN
JOHN L. MEDEIROS, JR.
PAUL C. MERIDA

THOMAS B. MERRITT, JR.
CHRISTOPHER V. MEYERS
MARK W. MICKE
BRIAN W. MULLERY
CHRISTOPHER P. OCONNOR
ROSS A. PARRISH
TEAGUE A. PASTEL
TERRY M. PAUSTENBAUGH
ROBERT A. PETERSEN
FORD C. PHILLIPS
TIMOTHY R. POWLEDGE
STEVEN D. PUCKETT
OMAR J. RANDALL
MARK R. REID
BRIAN T. RIDEOUT
BENJAMIN S. RINGVELSKI
WILFRED RIVERA
MICHAEL J. ROACH
LEE M. RUSH
BRIAN E. RUSSELL
DENNIS W. SAMPSON, JR.
DENNIS A. SANCHEZ
DOUGLAS C. SANDERS
KURT J. SCHILLER

WILLIAM F. SCHOEN, JR.
SAMUEL C. SCHOOLFIELD
DEAN A. SCHULZ
MICHAEL P. SHAND
BRIAN P. SHARP
MATTHEW R. SIMMONS
PATRICK E. SIMON
TRES C. SMITH
MICHAEL W. STEHLE
ROBERT A. SUCHER
BYRON D. SULLIVAN
ERIC N. THOMPSON
BRADFORD W. TIPPETT
CHARLES R. VONBERGEN
KIPP A. WAHLGREN
ROBERT S. WEILER
SIDNEY R. WELCH
WILLIAM T. WILBURN, JR.
ERIC W. YOUNG
ROBERT C. ZYLA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ARMANDO ACOSTA, JR.
DION A. ANGLIN
WAYNE A. BODINE
WILLIAM M. BOWERS
ADAM W. BRYSON
MARK J. CAMPBELL
PHILLIP E. CONSTANTIN, JR.
JASON B. CORCORAN
JOHN D. CORDONE
CORY M. CUNNINGHAM
JENNIFER M. DOLAN
CHARLES R. DONNELLY, JR.
DAWN N. ELLIS
MICHAEL L. FERRELL
SAMUEL C. GAZZO
JAMES R. HAIDERER
JAMES A. HANLEY II
ROBERT P. HEFFNER, JR.
NATHAN C. HENDERSON
GORDON L. HILBUN
GLEN R. HINES, JR.
STEWART M. JOHNSTON
EDWARD KERN
DANIEL R. KREIDER
BRENT E. LILLY
GARTH P. MASSEY
SCOTT W. MAYFIELD
JON C. MCDANIEL
ROSS A. MEGLATHERY
CHARLES A. MIRACLE
ANDREW W. RALSTON
JULIAN J. RIVERA
DEBRA SIMPSON
AARON J. SMITH
PATRICK F. TIERNAN
BRETT M. WILSON
LANCE A. WINDEL
DAVID K. WINNACKER
THEODORE L. WONG
ROGER M. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*PAULO T. ALVES
PATRICK J. TOAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*THESOLINA D. HUBERT
TIMOTHY W. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

HENRY W. SOUKUP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM W. INNS III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LONNIE M. MCGHEE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES B. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CRAIG A. ELLIOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BILL W. BROOKS, JR.
MICHAEL W. COSTA
KYLE L. HOLLIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

EDWARD J. ARMA
PATRICK C. ACOX
THOMAS A. ADAMS
JOEL G. ADOLPHSON
MILAD AFKHAM
JULIE E. AHO
ETHAN R. AKERBERG
ADESINA O. ALADETOHUN
CHRISTOPHER J. ALFARO
DAVID P. ALGER
NILS P. ALPERS
MATTHEW J. ALTOMARI
RYAN E. ALVIS
ANTHONY J. AMBRIZ
ELIZABETH AMEZCUA
JASON D. AMUNDSON
SCOTT A. ANDERSEN
CLAYTON T. ANDERSON
MICHAEL D. ANDERSON
RYAN C. ANDES
KRYSTA N. ANTHONY
TYLER J. ANTHONY
CARL T. ANTOINE
ROSS H. ARMSTRONG
JAMIE L. ASH
LOGAN P. ASH
SHANNON R. ASHLEY
NICHOLAS ASTACIO
JAMES P. AYULE, JR.
DANIEL A. BAIK
CHAD R. BAINBRIDGE
ARON M. BAKER
BENJAMIN B. BAKER
JOHN D. BAKER, JR.
BRIAN T. BALDWIN
MATTHEW T. BARNES
MICHAEL T. BARNUM
WILLIAM E. BARR
PHILIP A. BART
BRIAN J. BASILE
LOUIS T. BATSON V
GARY S. BAXTER
DANIEL G. BECK
ANDREW V. BEHREND
CARL P. BEHER
COLLIN B. BELL
COREY R. BELTON
ROBERT R. BENDA III
JOSHUA C. BENSON
VINCENT J. BERARDINO
TIMOTHY J. BERGER
REBECCA K. BERGSTEDT
EVAN D. BERNSTEIN
ADAM E. BEST
BRENT C. BIRCHUM
LANIER A. BISHOP III
RICARDO R. BITANGA
JOHN D. BLACK
MARC J. BLAIR
STEPHEN M. BLANCHETTE
MARY E. BLOOM
MELISSA G. BLYLEVEN
MARK W. BOCK, JR.
WILLIAM K. BOGNER
DANIEL J. BONO
JOSEPH H. BORGARDT
COLTON G. BOWSER
NICHOLAS A. BOXEY
BOBBY J. BRADFORD
BUCK A. BRADLEY
JOHN G. BRADLEY
KRAEGEN J. BRAMER
RANDY K. BRAZILE
DAVID M. BRENNAN
MICHAEL D. BRESLIN
CHRISTOPHER M. BROMLEY
CHARLES E. BROUN
BENJAMIN J. BROUSSARD
WILLIAM D. BROWN
MITCH A. BRUCE
STAFFORD A. BUCHANAN
BENJAMIN J. BULLOCK
JESSE A. BURDICK
BRIAN L. BURGER
LUCAS J. BURKE
CATHERINE J. BURNS
DANIEL F. BURNS
JONATHAN B. BUSH
JOHN J. BUSS
BENJAMIN G. BUTLER
DALLAS T. BUTLER
NICHOLAS R. BUTNER
CHARLES T. BYERS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. CAIN
DAVID M. CAIN
CODY M. CALHOUN

AUDREY F. CALLANAN
JOHN J. CAMPBELL
SEAN C. CAMPBELL
MARCO A. CAMPOS
JOSHUA C. CANATSEY
KELLY M. CANDIES
RYAN F. CAPDEPON
JAMES M. CAPPABIANCA
JEFFREY F. CARBEN
EDGARDO B. CARDONA
SEAMUS B. CAREY
MARCUS J. CARLSTROM
JUSTIN M. CARRASCO
LINDSEY M. CARROLL
BRIANA L. CARTER
MATTHEW E. CARWILE
CHRISTOPHER K. CASTAGNETTI
ZACHARY J. CESARZ
BRIAN M. CHAMBERLAIN
KALEY S. CHAN
JOSEPH M. CHAPPELL
KEENAN J. CHIRHART
DANIEL S. CHIRIBOGA
BRIAN K. CHONG
ERIC J. CHUNG
RUSSELL H. CLARKE
MELANIE N. CLIFTON
HENRY A. COBB
JORDAN R. COCHRAN
JONATHAN M. COHEN
WILLIAM M. COLEMAN
JOHN T. COLLINS
DOUGLAS A. COLUMBUS
JAMES P. CONNOLLY
DANIEL D. CONTI
KATIE A. COOK
SCOTT W. COOK
ROBERT A. COPLEN
CHRISTOPHER R. CORBEILLE
SETH C. CORMIER
NARCISO CORRAL, JR.
ISAAC CORTES
MIGUEL A. CORTEZ
JORGE C. COUTO
DANIEL G. COWDEN
JOSHUA S. COX
LUCAS A. CRIDER
JOHN W. CRITT
ROY B. CROCKETT
VICTORIA M. CROWDER
KYLEIGH M. CULLEN
CHRISTOPHER S. CZEPIEL
CHRISTOPHER J. CZUMAK
GREGORY R. CZYZEWSKI
LANE A. DAIGLE
MATTHEW E. DALTON
DUONG K. DAM
WILLIAM F. DAMMIN
JASON M. DASILVA
MATTHEW C. DUGHERTY
MATTHEW H. DAVIDHIZAR
LOGAN M. DAVIS
MARCUS R. DAVIS
RON O. DAVIS
RUSSELL J. DAWSON
DIRK A. DAZA
WILLIAM R. DEFRENCIS
DANIEL DELARA
BRETT A. DEMARIA
TRAVIS G. DENNY
CODY W. DENTON
JOEL L. DETRICK
CHRISTOPHER D. DEVRIES
JASON F. DEWALD
JAROD W. DICKS
STEPHEN A. DIGIROLAMO
MATTHEW J. DILLON
MATTHEW M. DISTEFANO
ANDREW F. DO
ANDREW N. DOBSON
TAYLOR T. DODD
WILLIAM H. DODSON
MICHAEL A. DORSEY
WILLIAM J. DUBOIS
DEAN R. DUKES
JACOB S. DUNN
SEAN M. ECKERT
MARK S. EDGAR
STEPHEN V. EGERDAHL
THEODORE T. EHLERT
TIMOTHY D. EHRHARD
EDUARDO ELIZONDO
MEGAN L. ELLIOTT
ALEXIS R. ELLIS
BRENT A. EMERY
DAVID R. EMISSION II
JAMES G. ENGLEHART
JOHN R. EPES
ROBERT J. EPSTEIN
ANDREW C. ERICSON
SLADE B. ERMIS
DANIEL E. ERTEL
ANTHONY O. ESPINOZA
PATRICK S. ESTVOLD
MARK D. EVANS
ANDREW H. EVERITT
EVAN J. FAIRFIELD
BRIAN A. FELBY
DAVID P. FEMEA
PHILLIP D. FERNANDEZ
CAITLIN T. FERRARELL
DANIEL P. FIRESTONE
KARL E. FISHER
ALEXANDRA C. FITZGERALD
DANIEL P. FITZGERALD
MARK T. FITZGERALD
KEVIN J. FITZSIMMONS

ERIC D. FLANAGAN
KEVIN N. FLIPPIN
MICHAEL S. FLURRY
JEREMY M. FORRER
MATTHEW S. FORSHEE
WILLIAM J. FORTIN
DAVID M. FOUTI
JOHN M. FOUT
BOBBY T. FOWLER
CALEB L. FRANZOY
JOSHUA A. FRELANT
GREGORY A. FREVERT
THOMAS A. FREY
JUSTIN A. FRICKIE
BRADLEY C. FROMM
SCOTT A. FURLONG
ERIC M. GALLOWAY
MARCIAL J. GARCIA
BENJAMIN E. GARDNER
JOHN G. GARLASCO, JR.
RAUL P. GARZA
TODD J. GASTON
JARED R. GASTROCK
JUSTIN M. GATES
JONATHAN S. GAYMAN
BRIAN T. GEISEN
TRAVIS P. GELETZKE
ANDOM T. GHEREZGHIHER
MARK A. GILBERT
JENS A. GILBERTSON
MATTHEW F. GLISSON
BRENT P. GODDARD II
ROBERT E. GOLIKE
LEAH M. GONNELLA
FOUA C. GONZALES
EDUARDO A. GONZALEZ
JOSE GONZALEZ
DAVID A. GOODMAN
DAVID E. GOODRICH
BRIAN A. GOSS
TROY D. GOSS
DANIEL S. GREEN
LAWRENCE D. GREENE
BRIAN D. GRIFFITH
CRAIG D. GRINDLE
ROSS F. GRUNEWALD
BRIAN C. GRYGO
ROBERT W. GRZELAK
ANTHONY M. GRZINCIC
GEOFFREY J. GUTIERREZ
BRIAN D. HALL
ELIZABETH M. HALL
KRISTINE S. HALL
SHAUN I. HALL
THOMAS C. HAMBIDGE
RYAN L. HAMILTON
DANNY A. HAMLEN
JERROD C. HAMMES
CHRISTOPHER B. HAMPTON
KEVIN R. HANRATTY
CODY L. HARDENBURGH
JOSEPH W. HARDIN
MARILYN L. HARLEY
ERINN T. HARP
ROBERT G. HATCHLEY, JR.
BILLY J. HAYES
HUNTER S. HAYES
WILLIAM M. HAYNES
SAMUEL T. HEATH
ELEUTERIO R. HECHANOVA
BRIAN E. HETTER
BENJAMIN T. HELD
WILLIAM A. HEMME
JOSHUA D. HERM
TERRY J. HERZOG, JR.
BRENDAN P. HEWETT
JASON B. HIBLER
TIMOTHY M. HICHAK
SEAN C. HICKS
ERIK W. HICKSON
GRAHAM D. HILL
RUSSELL A. HILL
JARED D. HIMES
BRIAN A. HINRICHS
JOHN P. HINTON
BENJAMIN S. HIPKINS
YUWYNN E. HO
LEVI A. HOPTS
PATRICK S. HOLCOMB
JAMES B. HOLDERBAUM
MICHAEL G. HOLMBERG
JAMES M. HOLT, JR.
NICOLE P. HOLT
TIMOTHY J. HOOTEN
SARAH K. HORN
BENJAMIN C. HOUGH
NATHAN E. HOULE
DANIEL R. HOUSINGER
JARED B. HOWELLS
WILLIAM J. HUNTER
SARAH M. HUTCHINSON
RICHARD A. IAFELICE
RYAN T. IDEN
TIMOTHY R. IRISH
JUSTIN Y. ITO
JUAN J. ITURRAGA
JAMES M. JACKSON
MAKOTO C. JACOBS
ALEX P. JAMES
DAVID A. JANECKE
ROBERT J. JANKOWSKI
CLAYTON C. JAROLIMEK
NATHAN L. JEFFCOAT
STEPHENSON S. JOHN
GARRETT D. JOHNSON
JOSHUA J. JOHNSON
JOSHUA R. JOHNSON

ROBERT L. JOHNSON III
BRADLEY A. JONES
JOHN D. JONES
KEVIN P. JONES
KIMBERLY J. JONES
MARGARET A. JONES
NEAL T. JONES
CORY C. JURE
KAREN E. KALLAUR
KYLE B. KANODE
CHRISTOPHER P. KARLE
ERIC M. KASKELA
JESSICA M. KASTER
JOEL M. KATZ
EDWARD W. KAY III
GLEN M. KELSO, JR.
MATTHEW S. KENDRICK
STEPHEN D. KENT
EUSTRATIOS N. KERAMIDAS
BRIAN D. KERREBROCK
THUONG H. KIEU
BRIAN C. KIMMINS
RYAN R. KINDER
GREGORY J. KIRSCH
WILLIAM H. KLOTH
HAROLD A. KNUPP, JR.
MARK W. KOCIBA
ERIC B. KOSELAK
MATTHEW J. KRAYEWSKY
ANDREW C. KREBS
MATTHEW A. KREMPPEL
JOLANTA O. KREMPIN
JOHN J. KRESS
MATTHEW M. KRIVOHILAVY
MATTHEW J. KRUGGEL
BRYANT J. KRUSE
DAVID M. KUCIRKA
CHARLES A. KUHNMUECH IV
BRIAN J. KUJAWSKI
JUSTIN K. KUNERT
KARL T. KURBIKOFF
JAMES M. LAFLEUR
NATALIE M. LAMM
PAUL J. LANGFESTER III
JACK R. LARIMORE III
BRIAN M. LARSON
LYNN M. LARSON
JEREMY D. LAUX
BRIDGER LEARY
BENJAMIN C. LEATHERBURY
BENJAMIN R. LENOX
IAN M. LEONARD
JOHN J. LEONARD III
EDWARD J. LESLIE
ANDREW M. LEWIS
JOSHUA M. LEWIS
JUSTIN A. LEWIS
TOBIN J. LEWIS
ALEX H. LIM
ADAM V. LINK
RYAN C. LIPTON
JEFFREY E. LITTLE
DWAYNE M. LITTLEJOHN
ROBERT K. LIVENGOOD
KRISTOFFER P. LJUNGGREN
SHAUN R. LOCKLEAR
BRENT E. LOGAN
JAMES W. LONG
SHAWN R. LUGHMAN
DANIEL C. LOVE
KEVIN M. LOWE
GREGORY Z. LUCAS
THOMAS D. LUCEY
JOSEPH W. LUKEFAHR
LYNELLE S. LUND
ROBERT J. LUNDGREN
ADRIAN R. LYONS
JAMES S. MACKIN
JENNIFER V. MACKOWIAK
MICHAEL P. MADIA
STEPHEN M. MAGEE
JOHN R. MAGILL
WILLIAM A. MAHONEY
WILLIAM J. MAJESKI IV
DANIEL M. MAJTAN
ROBERT E. MALCOLM
MATTHEW J. MALINOWSKI
ANDREW R. MANAOIS
BRUCE A. MANUEL, JR.
VINCE S. MARGIOTTA
NICOLE D. MARINELLI
STEPHEN R. MARO
CHRISTOPHER D. MARSH
ERIC E. MARSHMAN
ANDREW J. MARTIN
FRANK J. MASTROMAURO
MARIN MATLJEVIC
ERIC J. MATTHEWSON
ANDREW G. MAXWELL
SEAN T. MCCARRAGHER
ERIC M. MCCUSKER
PATRICK B. MCDONALD
JOHN D. MCDOW
GRANT W. MCDOWELL
PATRICK A. MCELROY
GREGORY W. MCGOUGH
JESSE R. MCGOUGH
KYLE J. MCHUGH
VANESSA M. MCKEE
JEREMY D. MCLEAN
KEVIN W. McMULLEN, JR.
DANIEL S. MCNEAR
TIMOTHY J. MCPHAK
CHRISTOPHER A. MEADOWS
KYLE D. MEEDER
JOSEPH S. MEISEL
JASON MERTILUS

KYLE T. MEYER
DAVID J. MILLER
JACOB B. MILLER
NATHANIEL G. MILLER
SETH C. MILLER
MERRITT T. MITCHELL
CHARLES M. MOHLER
BRADLEY J. MOHR
FREDERICK D. MONDAY
JEFFREY C. MONROE
CHRISTOPHER G. MONTGOMERY
DALHIA G. MONTGOMERY
SAMUEL E. MOORE
SEAN E. MOORE
ALEXANDER MORA
TAYLOR S. MORAWSKI
ROBERT D. MORGAN
STEVEN L. MORRIS, JR.
WILLIAM C. MORRISON
MATTHEW M. MORSE
GREGORY T. MOYNIHAN
JOHN J. MUELLER
MOLLY A. MULDOON
JOSHUA W. MUNSEE
LUIS E. MURILLO, JR.
JOSEPH P. MURPHY
DAVID R. MURRAY
THOMAS F. NEWCOMB
ERIN B. NEWPORT
KEVIN C. NICHOLSON
MICHAEL A. NIEMAN
TIMOTHY C. NOLAN
JASON N. NOLL
JUSTIN M. NOONE
MICHAEL A. NORDIN
ROSS L. NORMAN
STEVEN G. NORRIS
DAVID K. NOVAK
DUSTIN M. OAKES
JEREMY A. OBERDOVE
CASEY M. ODOHERTY
BENJAMIN J. ODONNELL
MARK R. ODRISCOLL
FLEMAY A. OGBASION
KATHLEEN J. OHARA
TAKASHI OKAMOTO
KVABENA O. OKYERBOATENG
CHARLES C. OLSON
YULIYA OMAROV
JORGE A. ORNELAS
SEAN R. ORourke
KEVIN B. OSBORNE
JAMES T. OSHAUGHNESSY
JOSEPH A. PACENTRILLI
ZACHARY J. PAGAN
BRADLEY C. PALM
JEFFREY P. PARDEE
ANTHONY A. PARKER
DAVID J. PARKER
LAWRENCE T. PARKER, JR.
MATTHEW D. PARSONS
JONATHAN A. PATRAS
JOSEF E. PATTERSON
ANDREW E. PAUL
JAMESON S. PAYNE
EDWIN S. PAZ
MARIELA PENA
WILLIAM T. PENDERGAST
MICHAEL J. PENN
JARED L. PERRY
MATTHEW T. PERRY
BRADLEY M. PETERSEN
TRAL A. PETERSON
JUSTIN D. PETTY
TYVON J. PETWAY
CHRISTOPHER M. PHIFER
CHAD J. PIMPLEY
SHAWN J. PINEY
PATRICK J. PORT
NICHOLAS J. POTOSKY
CHARLES A. POULTON
JUSTIN J. POUILL
WOLF J. POWELL
CHAD R. PRESLEY
GREGORY B. PROCCACCINI
JAMES P. PSYHOGIS
DANIEL B. PURSEL
JOHN D. QUAIL
STEPHAN J. QUIRK
BRIAN A. RADLER
ANDREW W. RAICH
SEAN G. RAMIREZ
JEFFREY D. RANDALL
ELIOT V. RASMUSSEN
JOEL N. REA
BENJAMIN C. READING
MATTHEW R. RECKER
CHRISTOPHER A. REITTHMANN
NORMAN L. RENFRO
VICTOR H. RESILLAS
ERIC C. REW
TIMOTHY J. REYNOLDS
ERIK D. REINHART
JONATHAN L. RICHARDS
SCOTT A. RICHARDS
THOMAS A. RIGBY
WILLIAM L. RIORDON
EDDIE R. RIVERA
DELL L. ROBINSON
ERNEST C. ROBINSON
LARS N. ROCKHOLM
SHON C. ROGEGE
STEVEN P. ROGERS
DAVID M. ROOKS
JOHN S. ROSE
ANNAELIZAB M. RUBIOFLEISCHER
JOHNATHAN J. RUDY

JOSEPH M. RUSSELL
MATTHEW R. RUSSELL
RYAN J. RUSSELL
ERIK C. RYE
DANE C. SAGERHOLM
BRANDON A. SALTER
VIC E. SANCEDA
DEREK C. SANDERS
SCOTT B. SANDERS
GEOFFREY L. SANFORD
PAUL W. SANFORD
VINCENT E. SAPEDA II
THOMAS J. SCANLAN
RYAN T. SCHEETZ
ERIC A. SCHEIBE
DUSTIN R. SCHELEGLE
BROCK H. SCHELLER
PATRICK C. SCHERER
BRADLEY J. SCHMIDT
JEREMY W. SCHNARR
PATRICK A. SCHRAFFT
DANIEL J. SCHREINER
ANDREW P. SCHROERS
THOMAS K. SCHUEMAN
CARLY E. SCHWARZENBERG
CHRISTOPHER L. SCZEPANIK
ADRIENNE C. SERBAROLI
JACOB L. SHANTON
KYLE P. SHEA
JASON C. SHEVOKAS
JONATHAN SHIH
DEREK L. SHIVERS
THOMAS A. SHORT
BENJAMIN J. SIEGEL
RICHARD M. SIERRA
DAVID R. SIMON
MICHAEL J. SIMPSON
RODERICK J. SINGLETON, JR.
ZERBIN M. SINGLETON
SHARON A. SISBARRO
MICHAEL J. SKALICKY
JOHN P. SKOGMAN
NICHOLAS M. SMART
ALEXANDER G. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER M. SMITH
CLARK K. SMITH
GEOFFREY A. SMITH
JACOB S. SMITH
JAMES S. SMITH
JUSTIN E. SMITH
ALLISON N. SMYCZYNSKI
SCOTT L. SNYDER
KIMBERLY J. SONNTAG
JOSHUA R. SOUTHERLAND
WILLIAM W. SOUTHWARD III
STEVEN M. SPRIGG
DERICK E. STAFFENSON
GEORGE B. STAMPS
DONALD J. STANFORD
JAMES C. STANLEY
WILLIS R. STATOY
BENJAMIN K. STEELE
SHAWN C. STELZEL
DIMITRI STEPANOFF
SEAN M. STEPHENSON
LOUIS V. STRAMAGLIA, JR.
JARED W. STREETER
RYAN T. STREHL
BRIAN J. STROM
JOHN P. STUART
GENEVIEVE M. STUDER
JASON L. SULLIVAN
MILES J. SULLIVAN
SEAN B. SULLIVAN
FRANK W. SWAN, JR.
ROBERT S. SWARTZ
SPENCER D. SWEET
JOSEPH C. SWINDELL
HEIDI C. SYKAS
JOHN W. SYKAS III
MITCHELL W. SYMES
DANIEL M. TADROSS
RAYMOND N. TAKOR
ERIK J. TARABA
ERIAN E. TAYLOR
JOSEPH E. TAYLOR
SEAN R. TAYLOR
VINCENT J. TEIXEIRA
LINK T. TERRY
MICHAEL J. THOMAS
SHAUN E. THOMAS
NICHOLAS M. THOMPSON
VINCENT L. THOMPSON
KEITH I. TOUCEY III
MICHAEL A. TOZZOLO IV
DAVID J. TRAIL
BRADEN T. TRAINOR
KEITH E. TROJNIAK
CHRISTOPHER A. TUCKER
MATTHEW I. TWEED
CHRISTOPHER M. ULCAK
STEVEN J. UZIEL
RONALD E. VALASEK, JR.
STEVEN A. VALENTI
MITCHELL J. VANDERKODDE
GREGORY S. VARELLA
RICHARD A. VAYNSHTEYN
OCIE C. VEST
GREGORY M. VETETO
JEFFREY D. VICKERS
SHANE J. VIGL
JAMISON T. VINCENT
KURT M. VOGLER
JOSHUA C. WADDELL
JONATHAN R. WALASKI
JOSHUA J. WALL
JONATHAN B. WALLACE

ROBERT K. WALLACE
 CRAIG M. WARNER
 STEVEN M. WARNER
 TIMOTHY O. WARREN, JR.
 WILLIAM G. WATHEN
 TAMARA D. WATKINS
 JASON M. WEAVER
 DANIEL E. WEBBER
 NICHOLAS D. WEBSTER
 MICHAEL A. WEHNER
 SHAWN C. WEHRLE
 ROBERT A. WELLS
 WALTER M. WEST
 CHAD N. WETHERALD
 JEREMY A. WHEELER
 CHRISTOPHER P. WHELAN
 SCOTT A. WHIPPLE
 THOMAS K. WHITESEL
 ALLEN R. WHITLOW
 CHRISTOPHER S. WHITSON
 JACOB E. WIDRICK
 COREY J. WIELERT
 DUSTIN L. WILCOX
 DANIEL R. WILHELM
 JACK B. WILLIAMS
 JEREMY R. WILLIAMS
 RYAN E. WILLIAMS
 TAYLOR F. WILLIAMS
 WAYNE P. WILLIAMS
 ERIC J. WILMOTT

KYLE T. WILSON
 WILLUS B. WITHROW
 CAMERON P. WOLF
 CHRISTOPHER J. WOOD
 MATTHEW L. WOOD
 TINA J. WOODRUFF
 JAMES W. WOODS
 ALEX D. WOODWARD
 MICHAEL D. WRIGHT
 TYLER C. WRIGHT
 ANDREW A. YAGER
 AUSTIN T. YAGLE
 KYLE D. YAKOPOVICH
 VLADIMIR Y. YARNYKH
 HYUNHAK YIM
 ANGELA D. YOUMANS
 VINCENT V. YOUNG
 JACOB M. ZABOROWSKI
 JONATHAN J. ZAINEA
 GEORGE R. ZEIGLER
 DIANNA R. ZEMPEL
 GREGORY T. ZERR
 JOSEPH A. ZIMMERMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
 RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN R. ANDERSON

JOHN ANTHENOR
 MICHAEL E. BELL
 LEE A. BOYCE
 DANIEL A. BRENES
 KARL A. BRONK
 THOMAS B. CARSON
 MICHAEL S. GRINER
 ROBERT C. HOFFMAN
 ZACHARY B. ISBERNER
 PATRICK J. JONES
 TREY B. KENNEDY
 JOON M. LEE
 LUIS E. MARTINEZPEREIRA
 IAN C. MCDONALD
 DAVID K. MOBERG
 ADAM E. MOORE
 TIMOTHY M. MOORE
 RICHARD PIERRE
 EUGENE J. PORTER
 JULIA N. WEBER
 STEPHEN W. WHITE
 MICHAEL D. WILCOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE
 CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEVEN P. HULSE